DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 307 HE 023 295

AUTHOR	Wingfield, Clyde J., Ed.
TITLE	Faculty Responsibility in Contemporary Society. Proceedings of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities La Sapienza Conference (Rome, Italy, June, 1989).
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-880044-118-6
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	148p.; Only the U.S. papers from this American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the University of Rome--American-Italian binational conference on higher education are included.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle/Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-1192 ($17.50).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Books (010)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; College Faculty; *Comparative Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; School Community Relationship; Social Structure; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Italy

ABSTRACT

The 10 U.S. papers included in this collection discuss the organization, governance, problems, values, and faculty role of higher education in institutions of higher education in the United States. Major differences are identified in the introduction (Clyde Wingfield), including tendencies for American universities to be more integrated into economic and political processes and for Italian universities to be more linked to the past with their professors maintaining a higher social status. Differences in funding patterns and administrative structure are also identified. The papers have the following titles and authors: "Challenges Met, Challenges Facing the Modern American University and its Faculty" (Clifton Conrad and Eugene Trani); "An Education for Every American Worker" (Joseph Murphy); "The Socioeconomics of the College Curriculum" (David Lavin); "Faculty Governance: Old Wine in New Bottles" (Carol Guardo); "Momentum, Not Miracles: The Need to Embrace Technology in the Classroom" (Peter Cayan); "Idealistic and Pragmatic Reasons for the Importance of Faculty Research and Scholarship" (Judith Sturnick); "Faculty as Boundary Spanners: Responsibilities External to the Campus" (William Monat); "Partnerships with Business Challenge Traditional College Roles" (Robert Scott); "The Faculty Role in Maintenance of Professions and Promotion of the Arts" (Jewel Plummer Cobb); "Faculty Community Service: Contribution and Consequence" (John Unrue). An appendix lists the conference agenda. Most papers have references. (DB)

ED318307

Faculty Responsibility in Contemporary Society

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 023 295

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Faculty Responsibility In Contemporary Society

Clyde J. Wingfield
Editor

American Association of State
Colleges and Universities

© 1990 by American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

Distributed by arrangement with:
University Publishing Associates, Inc.
4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706
3 Henrietta Streete, London WC2E 8LU England

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Faculty responsibility in contemporary society/Clyde J. Wingfield, editor.
p. cm.
Papers presented at the Conference on the Role of the University Professor in Contemporary Society, held at the University of Rome in June 1989.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-88044-119-4. —ISBN 0-88044-118-6 (pbk.)
1. Universities and colleges—United States—Faculty—Congresses. 2. Universities and Colleges—United States—Administration--Congresses. 3. Education, Higher—United States—1965—-Congresses. I. Wingfield, Clyde J. II. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. III. Conference on the Role of the University Professor in Contemporary Society (1989 : University of Rome)
LB2331.72.F33 1989 89-27038
378.1'2'0973—dc20 CIP

AASCU Participants at University of Rome La Sapienza Conference

Professor Peter Cayan, President, State University of New York, Utica-Rome
Professor Jewel Plummer Cobb, President, California State University-Fullerton
Professor Clifton Conrad, Chair, Department of Higher Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Professor Roland Dille, President, Moorhead State University (MN)
Professor Carol Guardo, President Rhode Island College
Professor Evelyn Hively, Vice President, Academic Programs, AASCU
Professor Linda Bunnell Jones, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Minnesota State University System
Professor Richad Landini, President, Indiana State University
Professor David Lavin, Department of Sociology Graduate Center, City University of New York
Regency Professor William Monat, Department of Public Administration, Northern Illinois University
Professor Joseph Murphy, Chancellor, City University of New York
Professor Robert Scott, President, Ramapo College (NJ)
Professor Judith Sturnick, President, Keene State College (NH)
Professor Eugene Trani, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin System
Professor John Unrue, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Professor Clyde J. Wingfield, Senior Fellow, AASCU, and Chair, AASCU Conference Planning Committee, and Professor of Public Administration and Political Science, Northern Illinois University (on leave)

Contents

Introduction vii
Clyde J. Wingfield

1 Challenges Met, Challenges Facing the Modern American American University and its Faculty 1
Clifton F. Conrad and *Eugene P. Trani*

2 An Education for Every American Worker 27
Joseph M. Murphy

3 The Socioeconomics of the College Curriculum 39
David E. Lavin

4 Faculty Governance: Old Wine in New Bottles 55
Carol J. Guardo

5 Momentum, Not Miracles: The Need to Embrace Technology in the Classroom 65
Peter J. Cayan

6 Idealistic and Pragmatic Reasons for the Importance of Faculty Research and Scholarship 77
Judith A. Sturnick

7 Faculty As Boundary Spanners: Responsibilities External to the Campus 85
William R. Monat

8 Partnerships with Business Challenge Traditional College Roles 101
Robert A. Scott

9 The Faculty Role in Maintenance of Professions and Promotion of the Arts 109
Jewel Plummer Cobb

10 Faculty Community Service: Contribution and Consequence 117
John C. Unrue

Appendix: The Conference Program 129

Introduction

Clyde J. Wingfield

During January 1989 I represented the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) at an international conference on university governance, held at Ankara, Turkey. Afterward I stopped in Rome, Italy, at the request of Allan W. Ostar, president of AASCU, to confer with Rector Giorgio Tecce of the University of Rome and Director General Professor Saverio Avveduto[1] of the Ministry of Education concerning the development of an AASCU-University of Rome collaboration to present a binational conference on American and Italian higher education, focusing on the role and responsibility of faculty in the higher education systems of the two countries. The meetings with Tecce and Avveduto resulted in a general agreement and preliminary program outline for a conference to be hosted by the University of Rome in June 1989. A delegation of sixteen American (AASCU) presidents, vice presidents, and professors would prepare formal papers and responses to be matched by similar presentations from Italian scholars. This volume is a byproduct of that symposium and presents the edited papers of the American (AASCU) participants.

The conference was enlightening for the American delegation and, I believe, for our Italian colleagues, too. Because of the time, difficulties, and costs associated with translation, this volume contains only the AASCU contributions to the conference. It is expected that Professor Avveduto will edit the Italian papers for publication in Italian, and perhaps one day the two sets can be combined in both English and Italian editions. Special recognition and credit is due Professor Dr. Fiorella Conti, assistant to Director General Avveduto in the ministry and a professor of English language. Professor Conti's understanding of the language and culture of both sides made communication not only possible but easy. Throughout the planning and execution of the conference she was a skillful broker and talented conductor.

Why focus on faculty responsibility in the contemporary university, and why convene in Italy? The faculty is the crucial variable in the maintenance of the contemporary university. The public university's essential missions, teaching, research, and

service to a broader community are carried out by its faculty. Moreover, faculty members constitute an intellectual core in their communities. Often they are the primary supply and the effective demand for art and culture in their towns. Nationally they are among the leaders of the professions. Represented in faculty ranks are many leading scientists, humanists, and artists. As consultants, researchers, and strategists, they have enormous impact on the culture, economy, and government of both America and Italy. Faculty represent a neutral competence for criticism of society and its institutions as well as spirited proactivism. They are the intellectual fire starters and the cataloguers and organizers of a rapidly expanding knowledge base. In those cultures that have not developed an intellectual class (America included), university faculty come closest to filling that role.

By organizing knowledge into disciplines and defining the content of those fields—by deciding what is to be taught and what is a fit subject for research—faculty, to a great degree, determine what is "legitimate knowledge" and, thus, how society, economy and government will react and think.

As Professor Lavin in chapter 3 observes, although other institutions in society function to conserve knowledge, the faculty more than any other entity is charged with discovery of new knowledge. The university curriculum is to some degree an ordering mechanism, not only for the professions but for the general arrangement and use of information in society.

If the faculty is the university, then it is equally true that the university is the faculty. Faculty influence on society, and its legitimacy within that society is of the collective; that is, both the impact and legitimacy of faculty are rooted in the university. It is institutional influence and institutional legitimacy that give weight and sanction to faculty findings, pronouncements, and values. The university is irrelevant without the faculty. The faculty is powerless without the university.

Such an apparent symbiotic relationship would suggest inherent harmony of purpose. Yet during recent decades there has developed an increasing tension between faculty and their

institutions. In part this has happened because universities have become more integrated into "secular" society. The university is central to too many economic and political processes to be cloistered any longer. Many American faculty have not been socialized into holding "traditional" faculty values; to them, the university is just another work place. Therefore, the ivory tower today in America is more myth than reality. Universities conduct funded research for a wide range of purposes: policy formulation, economic advantage, national defense, improved health, and many others. While some research activities are applauded by all, others—lethal weapons research, for example—are denounced. In Italy, as in America, controversy in the wider society has spilled over onto the campus to affect disciplines as well as institutional policies and practices. The university concept has had an evolution over nearly a millennium. Structure and function have changed. But linkage with the past is clearer and much longer in Italy. The Italian faculty continues to function as a guild. This has created what Burton Clark has called a "mating of autocracy and collegiality."[2]

In America, confidence in authority at the higher levels of government has deteriorated during the past three decades. If some authority is suspect, then perhaps all authority is suspect. If the highest officials of government mislead, then perhaps higher officials in the university deceive. This skepticism has fed ordinary institutional pathology and created a new agenda for campus politicians—faculty and student. The frustrations and antagonisms of groups concerned with race, ethnicity, gender, economic status, and other interests often manifest in challenges to the legitimacy of authority, including the authority of the university. Collegiality, shared objectives, and purpose have eroded. Faculty morale has deteriorated, and the cycle of frustration, suspicion, and hostility has accelerated. In faculty councils, concerns about compensation and job security compete with, or replace, concerns about pedagogy and research. Collegiality, even civility, have been diminished. Vilification of the president

and other administrative officers has become common fare in faculty council meetings and in the student press.

Of course, not all campuses exhibit the above scenario. But faculty responsibility for institutional maintenance, including the maintenance of collegiality, has been eroded in the American university to a dangerous degree. The Italian case is cast differently, but the stresses of modern industrial urban society are sufficiently similar to invite comparison and empathy.

In Italy, the professor has had frustrations but still aspires to be philosopher-king, enjoying a status the American professoriate envies. The title *professor* in Italy is preferred above nearly all others. Professors sit on corporate boards, head large banking institutions, and occupy the ministries of government. They are among the leading voices in the arts and in politics. Yet their university salaries are somewhat less than those of their American counterparts, and they are not as responsive to the problems of their society as many in Italy feel their station demands.

Italian universities are among the oldest in Europe. Bologna dates from 1158. Although Italian universities are highly homogeneous under the authority of the national government, offering one degree—the Laurea—they vary in size, quality, and specialization. The University of Rome is the largest. Within the universities, academic fields are arranged into faculties (*facolta*). Professors are appointed to a faculty and function almost entirely within it. Similarly, students enter the university to specialize in a faculty, general education having been achieved in the secondary school. Admission to the university is won by secondary school performance and not upon application to the university. By tradition, the role of the Italian professor is to lecture and to give examinations. Faculty assume little responsibility for the student's development outside the subject area. Indeed, it is the responsibility of the student to acquire the specialized knowledge necessary to stand for examination.

Funding of the Italian university is provided directly by central ministry budgets. The administrative structure is lean by

American standards, with little resource devoted to such matters as student life, athletics, and the like. The rector is elected by the faculty. Academic affairs tend to be conducted by councils of professors. By tradition higher education in Italy is an elite activity and for a relative few, though the few are increasing and the modern system is more open.

Professors often serve in the Italian legislature. Since the legislature accomplishes its work through committees and the committees often take final action on bills (acting in *sede deliberante*), education committees are usually composed of professors, other educators, and education administrators. This academic oligarchy results from complex relations developed over a long period among the professor-chairs of the university, the subcommittees of the Senate, and the Chamber of Deputies, and facilitated by the vertical department lines of the executive structure and an unusual deference to scholars.[3]

Clark believes this national oligarchy of the professoriate rests on at least four general concepts: (1) a liberal tradition of elite leadership, (2) an administrative tradition of state monopoly of the public interest (as "public interest" becomes programmatic it is assigned to specific bureaus); (3) a Crocean tradition in Italian philosophy and culture (Benedetto Crocean 1866-1952 was a giant figure in Italian intellectual circles during the first half of the twentieth century. His historical idealism dominated. Even the Fascists left him free to criticize. Though not a professor, he became the model for the Italian professoriate—the philosopher-king, the generalist professor); (4) the concept that in education the professor knows best—the ideal of a self-determining group of scholars (the German Humboldtian model set to Italian music, plus the Italian tradition of the Guild).

The formal system ensures for the professor a place of dominance. The professor (the chair holder) manages an area of academic work and all personnel within that domain. This is an extensive delegation of authority to an operating subchief. Clark observes that in spite of democratic beliefs, professor-chair

holders in the Italian system have not made an effort to roll back the extensive surviving "Fascist legislation," which continues to protect and enhance their powers. It was "convenient and natural" to assume that the chair-holder-professor would act as a cultural leader and tutor for society—that the educational system exists first to serve the scholar-professor. In the American experience, only the practice of medicine and its framework of control by and for practitioners can serve as a partial analogue for the Italian professoriate. In both the American and Italian university, as with most of humankind, altruism and self-interest often conflict. If the Italian faculty seems to be less in conflict with authority, it is because individually and collectively Italian professors feel greater authority in society than do their American counterparts. But this is only true for senior faculty. Subordinate teachers in the guild are strictly supervised by chairs.

So what is it that American and Italian professors have in common to discuss? Obviously, the subject matter of the discipline, but that was not the focus of the conference held in Rome June 2 and 3, 1989, sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the University of Rome-Lapienza and the Italian ministry of education. The conference focused on the responsibility of the professor in the contemporary university. Participants came from different cultures and experiences. Institutional missions differed. But everyone shared a concern for the quality of education in both societies and the quality of faculty participation in the processes of the university and in society. They shared views, experiences, and sometimes passions, and they learned from one another.

There is little comparative literature about higher education. With a few notable exceptions, scholars have not valued their own home base as a focus for research. Studies that do exist tend to treat a single system. It is unfortunate that cross-cultural comparative study is rare in higher education because it would be uniquely helpful in putting one's own system in perspective. The AASCU participants' crash course in Italian higher education

provided a glimpse of antecedent values and traditions of American institutions and a better understanding of European systems. It also appeared that Italian universities benefited from interaction with AASCU representatives. AASCU institutions are more pragmatic and more closely connected to their communities. Faculty roles differ accordingly. Neither system has solved the dilemma of responsibility.

Within the context of faculty responsibility, the objectives of the Rome Conference were: (1) to examine how higher education is organized and governed in Italy and the United States, (2) to share common problems and values, (3) to study differences, (4) to explore the potentials and limitations of faculty service and responsibility in the two societies. These limited goals were achieved.

AASCU universities are unlike those in Italy. The roles of universities in society and of the professoriate are differently perceived by the two cultures. The roles of government vis a vis education are very different. But the conference was stimulating and sometimes exhilarating.

An American perspective follows.

Notes

[1]Saverio Avveduto has since retired from the Ministry of Education and is now president of the International Council on Education for Teaching (ICET). The conference was assisted by the ICET Regional Office for Europe.

[2]Burton Clark, *The Higher Education System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

[3]Burton Clark, *Academic Power in Italy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977).

1

Challenges Met, Challenges Facing The Modern American University And Its Faculty

Clifton F. Conrad
Eugene P. Trani

At the end of the twentieth century, the American university looms as a beacon on the landscape of contemporary American society. While not without its critics, the university is celebrated for its contributions to the quality of life both in the United States and throughout the world. Most especially, the university is admired for its contributions to the advancement of knowledge, which have immeasurably enriched the quality of human life; for its pivotal role in the education of millions of people to engage more fully in cultural, economic, social, and civic life; and for its willingness to assume a vital role—through teaching, research, and service—in the advancement of civilization.

Notwithstanding its stature and influence, the modern American university faces formidable challenges—challenges that strike at its purposes and responsibilities, its quality and integrity, and its basic values. In part, these challenges, both for the institution and its faculty, are rooted in the contemporary environment, but in a deeper sense, they are grounded in the historical development of American universities as multipurpose institutions that have responded vigorously to an intricate web of demands and opportunities presented by the larger society. An inquiry into the current challenges facing the American university and its faculty requires a historical understanding of how universities and their faculties have come to be so deeply enmeshed in the affairs and life of society.

Development of the American University and its Faculty

There were some heroic efforts to build universities before the Civil War, including the initiatives of Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia. But not until the last half of the nineteenth century did the university movement begin to take root. In no small measure, universities were inspired by the German univer-

sities and an "ivory tower" view of the university that emphasized learning and discovery for their own sake. However, as American society became more urban, industrialized, and specialized—in the throes of the industrial revolution—public demand grew for institutions that would provide the trained personnel, knowledge, expertise, and services that would contribute directly to the development of society. Whether through the reorganization of existing colleges or the establishment of new institutions, universities responded energetically to the needs and demands of American society.

The German universities substantially affected the development of American universities during the last half of the nineteenth century. Lured by the reputations of the great German universities—such as Halle, Gottingen, and Berlin—nearly ten thousand Americans studied in German universities during the nineteenth century. Many of these Americans, who were to return to the United States and become faculty members themselves, were impressed with German emphases on pure scientific scholarship that stressed the disinterested search for truth, on specialized training within academic departments, on the centrality of the graduate school, on the university as a haven from society, and on German academic practices.[1] In turn, they sought to adapt the German university model to the American.[2]

Notable among those who attempted to transplant German ideals onto American soil was Henry Tappan who, as president of the University of Michigan from 1852-63, was largely unsuccessful—because of a midwestern distrust of pure learning and research indifferent to utilitarian considerations. Yale University offered the first Ph.D. degree in 1961, but not until the establishment of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 was a major American university dedicated to advanced learning and the training of scholars in the German tradition.[3] Under the leadership of Daniel Coit Gilman, Johns Hopkins offered advanced work in the arts and sciences leading to the Ph.D. degree, developed specialized departments of knowledge, established the Ph.D. as

the preferred credential for the emerging profession of university teaching and, above all, fostered the idea of a university as an intellectual community committed to advanced learning and pure scientific scholarship.

In adapting the German university to America, Johns Hopkins had a widespread influence on the development of the American university in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[4] Most of the emerging American universities—private and public alike—had a commitment to a graduate faculty in the arts and sciences; to specialized knowledge organized around academic departments; to the academic career resting on the attainment of the Ph.D. degree; and to the "spirit" of a university dedicated to advanced learning and research—all of which characterized Johns Hopkins.[5] And yet, while the university ideal as expressed at Johns Hopkins influenced many institutions and even had a few imitators (notably Clark University), this ivory tower vision did not prove responsive to the immediate needs of American society.[6] The American ideal of a university and the role of its faculty were increasingly shaped more by the demands of the larger society than by the German model.

As American society became less agrarian and more industrial in the last half of the nineteenth century, public pressures grew on universities and their faculties to meet the utilitarian needs of the expanding society. Stimulated by the federal government and increased state support, state universities eagerly sought ways to transform themselves into institutions more responsive to society, especially through developing new fields of study and providing research directly benefiting society.

In 1862, Congress passed the Morrill Federal Land-Grant Act, which provided grants to each state for the support of at least one college "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."[7] These grants, coupled with annual state appropriations after the

Civil War, led to the steady growth of the major state universities in the last several decades of the nineteenth century. The most visible of these institutions—Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—were located in the Midwest, but the state university idea spread throughout the nation.

At the heart of the state university concept was an "all-purpose" curriculum offering the full range of vocations to students from all walks of life. Cornell University—which was only partly a land-grant institution—embodied not only the vocationalism of the land-grant movement, but also the emphases on science, technology, and "spirit of scholarship" of the university movement.[8] From the day it opened in 1868, Cornell captured the spirit of its founder, Ezra Cornell: "I would found an institution in which any person can find instruction in any study."[9] Partly in response to student interest in modern and applied fields of study, Cornell early established faculties and programs in a wide variety of fields—from history and social science to agriculture, mining, commerce and trade, and engineering.[10] In contrast to European universities—with their emphasis on the medieval professions of law, medicine, and theology—the American state universities and many leading private universities gradually introduced the younger professions at the undergraduate level: education, social work, business, agriculture, journalism, and architecture.

The emerging service ideal (indeed, responsibility) of the American university and its faculty further expanded at the turn of the century, when the spirit of Progressivism pervaded the United States. This movement, a massive effort to effect social improvement through government action, led many universities to build bridges to society by expanding their activities beyond traditional campus boundaries. The notion of service to society through outreach was most visibly demonstrated at the University of Wisconsin under President Charles Van Hise. The "Wisconsin Idea," as it came to be known, rested on two key notions: university extension, the idea that the boundaries of the state are

the boundaries of the university; and university expertise, the idea that the knowledge and informed expertise of the faculty should be applied to modern problems. At Wisconsin, for example, university professors applied their research to the improvement of the farming and dairy industries and were heavily involved in the reform of state government. Moreover, through extension work the university and its faculty initiated correspondence courses, sponsored debates, and offered services to people throughout Wisconsin. The success of the Wisconsin Idea stimulated many other state universities and private institutions to reach outward. Both Columbia University and the University of Chicago, for example, developed major extension programs.

There were two major, competing visions of the university and its faculty throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the one hand were advocates of a German university model, who emphasized pure scientific scholarship and advanced learning for their own sake. G. Stanley Hall, a professor at Johns Hopkins and later president of Clark University, expressed this perspective when he said that a university should promote "the holy fervor of investigation," and "research is its native breath, its vital air."[11] The opposing view was held by the leaders of most American universities—Charles Eliot at Harvard, William Angell at Michigan, William Folwell at Minnesota—who, without rejecting the model of a German university, sought to infuse the notion of service as a dominant feature of the university.

These competing visions continue to inform discussion about the purposes of the university, but the tendency since the turn of the century has been to "blend and reconcile."[12] The American university has assimilated major themes in nineteenth-century German higher education: learning and research as legitimate ends in themselves, the centrality of advanced training and the graduate school, the importance of specialized study within academic departments, and the need for doctoral training for the professoriate. At the same time, in response to the

demands and needs of American society, the model has grown far beyond these concepts to embrace the ideal of the service-oriented university that nourishes society directly through cultivating applied as well as theoretical knowledge; through offering an all-purpose curriculum to meet the needs of persons from across society; and through providing a range of services, such as extension and faculty expertise. The twentieth century has been marked by the continuing expression and refinement of this ideal.

The Growth and Spread of the University Ideal

Notwithstanding the protestations of such men as Thorstein Veblen and Abraham Flexner,[13] who published scathing attacks on the American university as a social service station, the advancing university ideal gained momentum through the first half of this century. The major public institutions—Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and California—and the leading private institutions—Chicago, Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Stanford—pioneered this movement. But scores of new universities sprang up, in such cities as Detroit and Milwaukee as well as in remote rural locations. Some of these universities were former teachers colleges or were built on existing colleges, while others—such as Wayne University—were completely new institutions.[14]

Many factors spurred the growth of the universities during the first half of this century. The continuing rise of industrial capitalism and the need for better-educated workers with specialized and advanced training; a general recognition that scientific research could contribute markedly to the quality of life; the growing belief in higher education as a vehicle of upper mobility on the part of the middle class; the widespread feeling that higher learning and the future of democracy were closely linked—such trends brought increased federal and state support, and strong private funding, for universities. During the Depression, for

example, the federal government established the College Student Work Program, which provided over 600,000 college students with part-time jobs; and the federal Public Works Administration helped finance construction projects at many universities.

To these and other pressures and incentives, the universities and their faculties responded enthusiastically. Growing interest in the professions led most universities to offer a much greater range of undergraduate professional programs, from the arts and journalism to pharmacy and communications—and to offer highly specialized programs within these fields. And, though the bulk of professional study took place at the undergraduate level through the first half of this century, many universities established graduate professional programs in such fields as architecture, business, and education.

Especially because of the professionalization of the faculty and the accompanying demand for Ph.D. degree holders to fill the faculty ranks, the spread of graduate education left its mark on the landscape of higher education during this period.[15] Whereas there had been fewer than 6,000 graduate students in the United States in 1900, by 1930 there were more than 47,000, and two decades later the figure was nearly 224,000. At the turn of the century, there were about 15 major graduate schools; by 1960 over 175 institutions offered doctoral degrees and more than 9,000 doctorates and 70,000 master's degrees were awarded annually.[16]

As the handmaiden of advanced study, the research emphasis in American universities increased steadily through the first five decades of this century. To be sure, the bulk of it took place at no more than twenty-five leading public and private universities, and there was no massive federally funded research during this period. As Roger Geiger has shown in his history of American research universities from 1900-40, the growth of both pure and applied research was accomplished largely through private sources of support.[17] Individual philanthropy and private foundation support—including corporate-sponsored research—

helped lay the foundation for the rise of American science and advanced research. With such discoveries as vaccines, hybrid corn, and atomic physics, scholars and scientists helped American universities rival the leading European centers of research.

As the twentieth century unfolded, the Wisconsin Idea spread, and most public universities embraced the idea of service in myriad ways. Discoveries in such fields as agricultural chemistry were carried to the people by means of flourishing university extension systems. Undergraduate degree programs and sponsored events were increasingly offered at off-campus locations at times convenient for working adults. University faculty worked closely with local and state governments, labor unions, and public school systems. As the president of a leading land-grant institution observed during the 1930s, "The state universities hold that there is no intellectual service too undignified for them to perform."[18]

Until about 1940, the private universities lagged in service considerably behind the land-grant universities.[19] Since then, however, private universities have been steadily providing more direct service to the larger society. Albeit with a full measure of skepticism, a leading humanities scholar at a major private university (Columbia University) captured the evolution of the service ideal at mid-century:

> The American university of today is best understood as a residual institution. What I mean by residual . . . [is that] the university is the last outpost of help, like the government of a welfare state. . . [So] the university now undertakes to give its students, faculties, and neighbors not solely education, but the makings of a full life, from sociability to business advice and from psychiatric care to the artistic experience. Again, every new skill or item of knowledge developed within the academy creates a new claim by the community. Knowledge is power and

> its possessor owes the public a prompt application, or at least diffusion through the training of others. It thus comes about that the School of Social Work aids the poor, the School of Architecture redesigns the slum, the School of Business advises the small tradesman, the School of Dentistry runs a free clinic, the School of Law gives legal aid, and the undergraduate college supplies volunteers to hospitals, recreation centers, and remedial schools.[20]

The Flowering of the American University

Since the end of World War II, various forces have affected the evolution of universities and their faculties. American universities have not been centrally directed by the national government, as in most of Europe, but the federal government has shaped the university movement in two major ways. First, beginning with passage of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act in 1944, which provided student aid to returning veterans, the federal government has provided a major stimulus to the extension of educational opportunity to new groups in society and to the advancement of social justice. Especially through the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the 1972 Higher Education Amendments, which established student aid programs for needy students, federal financial support has enabled millions of disadvantaged students to attend public and private universities throughout America.

Second, and no less significant, federal support for both basic and applied research has grown astronomically since 1945. In 1940, for example, the federal government provided $15 million in grants and contracts to universities for research and development; two decades later the figure had grown to $462 million.[21] By 1985, the total federal expenditure for university-

based research and development exceeded $10 billion.[22] Most federal research moneys have been allotted for national defense, health-related, and scientific and technological research—and have gone disproportionately to about fifty major research universities. Still, federal research funding has reached most universities and has supported scholarship in myriad fields of investigation.

The federal government has supported programs in areas of national concern, but state governments have been the major providers for public universities. Not only have the states created many new universities in the last forty years, they have also provided the financial foundation for universities to initiate literally hundreds of new degree programs, especially in professional and applied scientific fields; to hire and support faculty members in their research and teaching; to expand their extension and outreach efforts; and to expand their capacity to offer students advanced training at the master's, first professional, and doctoral levels.

The last few decades have also been marked by strong foundation support for both applied research and a wide variety of service activities addressing various social needs and problems. The Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations—among many others—have encouraged universities and their faculties to extend their reach to society. Schools of social work have reached out to the inner cities of America; schools of education have become deeply involved in improving the quality of public schooling; university professors offer technical advice, in areas from engineering to family planning, to the developing nations of the world, and students serve communities in such ways as providing legal advice.

As many American industries began to acknowledge their reliance on university-based research and to recognize the possibilities of technology transfer, American business and industry have also fueled the development of the contemporary university. Especially in the last decade, businesses have sought to develop

new connections with universities. These interactions have spawned many kinds of enterprises, from joint university-industry conferences to increased faculty consulting arrangements with industry to research parks and institutes on a growing number of campuses.

These forces—coupled with growing public support for the university—have cultivated the university movement during the last half-century. The inward-looking conception of a university has given way to a far more expansive view, one that celebrates the diversity of the modern university and its close connections to society. One of its strongest proponents, Clark Kerr, a former president of the University of California, coined the term *multiversity* in the early 1960s to capture the diverse purposes and activities of the modern university.

Although not all institutions can legitimately claim multiversity status, many ambitious academicians, politicians, community leaders, and others seek to bring that ideal to fruition. In the last two decades alone, scores of master's-level institutions have introduced doctoral-level work. Today, over 460 institutions identify themselves as "universities." Virtually all of these institutions have initiated a sprawling web of programs and activities, intended at least partly to buttress their claims as all-purpose American universities.

As universities have responded energetically to society's demands and opportunities, they have also encountered enormous stresses and strains. Perhaps foremost, university faculty have assumed a much broader range of responsibilities. Not only are they expected to conduct research, participate actively in their discipline or field, teach students from varying academic and cultural backgrounds, and participate in the governance of their institutions, but now they are also expected to engage in various service activities—from addressing pressing social problems and disseminating their research findings to providing advice to government and industry. In no small measure, this smorgasbord of Janus-like expectations mirrors the larger responsibili-

ties of the institution and, as such, provides a touchstone for the consideration of challenges facing the modern American university and its faculty.

Challenges

Enhancing the Quality of the Undergraduate Experience

As the university movement has flourished in the last forty years, graduate education has enjoyed immense prestige and prosperity. At the same time, while undergraduate enrollments have multiplied, a growing number of reports and publications from the federal government, the states, national commissions, and individuals have raised searching questions about the quality of undergraduate education in the nation's universities. In particular, two widely publicized books that were severely critical—Allan Bloom's The *Closing of the American Mind* and E. D. Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy*—have heightened concern.[23]

Concerns about undergraduate education have been many and varied. They range from the lack of curricular coherence to the neglect of the humanities; from the failure to establish high expectations for students to the decline of student involvement; from the triumph of the major and specialization over general education to the grip of professional fields at the expense of the liberal arts and sciences; and from the failure to adequately provide students with a common body of shared knowledge and culture to the lack of connectedness in the undergraduate experience. In response, universities have introduced an abundance of undergraduate reforms and innovations over the past few years. Scores of universities are strengthening their undergraduate programs through introducing more rigorous graduation requirements, establishing new interdisciplinary courses, placing greater emphasis on writing, mathematics, and science, and initiating developmental programs to enhance the basic skills of students.

The recent reforms and innovations in undergraduate education are an encouraging sign, and may go a long way toward reinvigorating the quality of the undergraduate experience for many students. Yet the reform movement has failed to recognize adequately that the problems and challenges in undergraduate education stem primarily from the evolution of American universities and, most especially, the activities most valued by the professoriate. Although most university faculty are expected to teach undergraduates, many place far more emphasis on research, grantsmanship, and other activities that can diminish their commitment to undergraduate teaching and learning.

To begin, many faculty have been lured by numerous opportunities outside the university—from lucrative consulting contracts to invitations to advise the government, industry, and various private agencies. Closer to home, most universities and their faculties place far more value on graduate education, research, and specialization than on undergraduate teaching. These emphases are hardly surprising, since they can pay handsome individual (as well as university wide) dividends: lifetime employment through tenure, access to substantial research funding, hefty salary increases, opportunities for travel invitations to membership in distinguished learned and professional societies, as well as the respect of one's peers. As noted by many observers of American colleges and universities, faculty members often speak of teaching "loads" and research "opportunities."

Although research is not the natural enemy of undergraduate teaching, the time is long overdue for American universities to develop a range of incentives aimed at restoring faculty commitment to undergraduate teaching and learning. Bold initiatives are needed—such as modifying reward structures and placing greater emphasis on the profession of teaching. Without them, the needed reform of undergraduate education will fall far short, and undergraduate education will continue to suffer from neglect. Such initiatives will require the strong support of fac-

ulty—no easy task, given competing pressures and opportunities—but the long-term viability of the American university requires no less.

Revitalizing the Professoriate

In 1968 Christopher Jencks and David Riesman published *The Academic Revolution*, which described the rise to power of scholars and scientists during the halcyon period of the 1950s and 1960s when American colleges and universities enjoyed unprecedented financial support.[24] In a recent follow-up study, Howard Bowen and Jack Schuster concluded that the American professoriate is "a national resource imperiled."[25] What has happened in the last two decades?

Though the reasons for concerns about the professoriate are complex, two factors stand out. First, salaries and working conditions have changed significantly. After peaking in 1972-73, faculty compensation has declined significantly in current dollars. In 1980, for example, real faculty salaries were 20 percent below what they had been a decade earlier largely because of inflation and lessened overall bargaining power as faculty hiring declined.[26] Though earning power has continued to decline in the 1980s, faculty have become increasingly dissatisfied with their work environments.

Overall, Bowen and Schuster found growing evidence that the American professoriate is increasingly "dispirited." Though faculty morale has remained higher at universities than in other types of institutions, it has nevertheless declined substantially over the past 5-10 years. Bowen and Schuster attribute this decline chiefly to the deterioration of faculty compensation and working conditions.[27]

Second, since the 1970s the academic labor market in many fields has ebbed because of declining or plateaued student enrollment patterns and a high proportion of tenured faculty who are not expected to retire in large numbers until the 1990s. A significant consequence of this trend is that many promising new

Ph.D.s—including potential minority faculty—are unable to secure permanent faculty positions. And at the same time, many talented graduates are attracted in greater numbers to high-paying jobs in private business and industry, which has caused a shortage of faculty in such high-demand fields as engineering, computer science, and business. Particularly disturbing is Bowen and Schuster's finding that "fewer and fewer persons, especially highly talented young persons, are opting for academic careers."[28]

These factors have created an urgent need for colleges and universities to develop strategies to recruit and retain talented faculty members. Indeed, many universities have already developed specific strategies for recruiting outstanding faculty within current constraints: paying higher salaries in high-demand fields, hiring top young faculty to tenure track positions while phasing out senior faculty, and modifying doctoral programs with the intent of training and then hiring their own graduates.[29] However, the major challenge for universities is to develop long-term strategies to address inadequate faculty compensation and a deteriorating work environment—the very conditions that have contributed so substantially to the current condition of the professoriate. Increasing faculty salaries and enhancing the infrastructures of universities—including laboratories, libraries, equipment, and facilities—could revitalize the professoriate.

Harnessing Linkages Between Scientific Research and Technological Innovation

In the last several decades, scientific research in universities has been yielding discoveries in many areas—from biotechnology to microelectronics—that have led many universities and their faculties to become heavily involved in translating scientific knowledge into various products. This involvement in technology transfer, which includes new university-industry relationships as well as solo institutional initiatives in the market place, has resulted from several important developments.

During the 1970s, American business and industry increasingly recognized the potential benefits of developing closer relations with universities. In addition to the overarching benefit of capitalizing on scientific discoveries to develop new products, industries realized that closer ties with scientific research communities could be cost effective: instead of expanding their own research capabilities, they could save money by drawing directly on the work of faculty scientists. At the same time, universities saw obvious benefits to university–industry collaboration: opportunities to secure major research support, to facilitate the rapid transfer of new technological developments to the market place, and to provide employment opportunities for students and faculty alike.[30]

The federal government has played a prominent role in uniting higher education and industry. To begin, the National Science Foundation began to fund university-industry cooperative research centers, where university faculty and corporate scientists work together on common problems, and to provide partial grants to support research projects involving both academic and industrial researchers. In addition, Congress passed a law in 1980 allowing universities to keep most patents resulting from federally funded research. Although a few universities have been seeking profits from their research for many years, this new law was a landmark for universities because the federal government supports much of the basic research in this country. Finally, and not incidentally, many state governments have strongly supported university-business connections, not least through the funding of research parks at major public universities to promote statewide economic development.

In addition to supporting faculty consulting in the industrial sector and to supporting industry-associates programs in which industry scientists visit campuses and develop relationships with their faculty counterparts, many universities have moved closer to the market place in two major ways. First, they have signed contracts with companies in which both parties agree

to collaborate on research programs of mutual interest. One of the most visible of these partnerships was established in 1975 between Harvard University and the Monsanto Company. Monsanto helped identify research needs and provided the financing, technology, and some services to support Harvard's research on the biology and biochemistry of organ development. In turn, Monsanto received exclusive rights for a limited period to commercialize products growing out of the research, with Harvard receiving royalties from either Harvard or Monsanto patents.[31] More recently, a number of universities have established research consortia in which they affiliate with several companies that pay a fee to support research in areas of mutual concern. Examples of such research consortia include the MIT-industry Polymer Processing Program and the Stanford Center for Integrated Systems.[32]

Second, many universities have moved quickly to commercialize patented scientific discoveries by establishing high technology companies to convert these discoveries into commercial products. For example, Boston University has committed nearly $50 million since 1980 to become the majority owner of a biotechnology company that is developing treatments to combat leukemia and other diseases.[33] According to some estimates, nearly 200 universities are now engaged in technology transfer; in the last few months, for example, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Chicago have established "multi-million dollar venture-capital funds to invest in start-up companies based on profitable work emerging from their labs."[34]

Technology transfer can not only benefit the economy but can also bring in resources to support research and scholarship in the university. At present, the benefits somewhat outweigh the risks. However, many universities have embraced technology without sufficient reflection—especially on the dangers of venture capitalism. Some vital issues must be pondered because the stakes are high:

> To what extent will the pursuit of financial reward influence the research agendas of faculty, the disinterested search for basic knowledge, and the free exchange of knowledge and ideas?
>
> Will there be conflicts-of-interest when researchers enact the dual roles of scholar-teacher and entrepreneur-investor?
>
> To what extent will faculty involved in technological development be drawn away from basic research and university teaching?
>
> In what ways will the quest for profit influence faculty hiring, retention, and rewards—and change relationships between universities and professors, as well as within the professoriate itself?[35]

Although a few universities have begun to address these questions seriously, there remains an urgent need for institutions and their faculties to confront these issues. Unless linkages between universities and the market place are harnessed, fundamental values in the university may give way to the search for commercial utility and financial gain. As Derek Bok stated in his insightful analysis of the benefits and dangers of technology transfer:

> With stakes of this size, the nature and direction of academic science could be transmuted into something quite unlike the disinterested search for knowledge that has long been thought to animate university professors. In short, the newfound concern with technology transfer is disturbing not only because it could alter the practice of science in the

university but also because it threatens the central values of academic research.[36]

Maintaining Institutional Integrity

Despite the widespread support enjoyed by most American universities, their integrity has been challenged both from within and without in the last few years. In addition to technology transfer, some of their other practices have come under attack: minority admissions and hiring procedures, employment practices, acceptance of gifts that may threaten academic values, investments in corporations doing business in such countries as South Africa, to local communities, oversight of athletic programs, and treatment of minorities and women. Individually and collectively, these concerns have engaged many faculty, administrators, students, and governing boards. The responses of many universities to these vexing issues has, on balance, strengthened the overall integrity of universities—though the scrutiny must continue.

However, the overall challenge to the integrity of universities rests not simply in those concerns that have received high public visibility. More fundamentally, they are rooted in the evolution of universities as service-oriented institutions that have—wittingly and unwittingly—made *service* the lodestar that heavily informs the daily lives of many faculty and administrators.

Lured by the possibilities of attracting outside support and the temptation to escape from routine responsibilities, many university faculty and administrators have increasingly been involved in developing urban institutes, interdisciplinary centers, and applied research think tanks. An intricate web of programs and activities has developed both on and off campuses, aimed broadly at making universities responsive to their various external stakeholders—federal and state government, business

and industry, private agencies, and the like. Moreover, despite guidelines at many institutions intended to limit faculty consulting to one day per week, many faculty and some administrators spend substantial amounts of time advising government and consulting with the private sector.

Although the value of service provided by American universities is clear, too many service commitments are quietly but relentlessly stripping away foundations of the university. For example, in some instances faculty consulting with industry may threaten faculty detachment and objectivity as scholars become influenced more by the economic market place of dollars than the academic market place of ideas. Not insignificantly, the university role of social critic seems to have diminished in recent years as faculty in the social sciences, as well as the sciences and the professions, have received a growing number of invitations to consult with industry and government.

Perhaps more significant, the service commitments of some faculty and administrators have resulted in considerable neglect of the basic purposes and values of universities. Initially, the neglect occurs in small ways: missed appointments, canceled classes, hastily prepared lectures. Gradually, teaching loads are negotiated downward and major commitments to basic research are postponed.[37] Over time, faculty commitments to research and teaching may decline markedly as the delicate cultural fabric of a university is eroded by service opportunities that individuals find difficult to resist.

Service has not undermined the American university—quite the contrary, it is a major strength of our universities—administrators and faculty need to be more selective in their service activities. In short, administrators and faculty need to make conscious decisions about what is essential and what is peripheral. University integrity is too precious to do otherwise. As noted by the former president of Ohio State University, Harold Enarson:

> The integrity of a poem or plan, of a lawyer's brief or mother's love, of the great ship or the tiny sailboat resides in its wholeness. For a thing to have integrity, it must be sparse and clean, without frills, pretentions, excess baggage. It must be true to its purpose, true in grand design and faithful in minute execution. So it is with women and men and the institutions they either ennoble or weaken by the quality of their daily service. In short, the integrity of an institution resides deep within its daily life.[36]

Bridging Administrative and Faculty Cultures in University Governance

Another major issue has developed in the last twenty-five years: how are universities governed, and what role does the faculty play in that governance? Traditionally, the major vehicle of governance for American colleges and universities has been the single-campus governing board, operating with considerable input from the faculty. Although senior administrators were traditionally faculty members, the political economy of limited resources of the 1970s and 1980s has made state governments become more actively involved in the governance of public institutions. Almost all states have developed multicampus systems of public institutions in which broad, policy-making authority is vested in a systemwide governing board. In fact, *centralization of authority* in both public and private institutions is perhaps the most significant trend in colleges and universities today, as all fifty states have in varying degrees become increasingly involved in shaping the direction of higher education.

This centralization and the increasing complexity of education have spurred the development of a cadre of professional administrators at colleges and universities all across the United States. Colleges and universities are now selecting leaders with management backgrounds and proven entrepreneurial skills,

who can introduce new strategies for coping with economic constraints, including controlling enrollments, selectively trimming budgets, reducing the number of faculty, and increasing efficiency. These administrators have also become active in long-range planning mission development, program development and continuance, and resource allocations, all activities traditionally handled by the faculty. Such developments have led to a growing gap between faculty and administration. Many faculty believe that these "new administrators" do not really understand universities and their responsibilities, nor do they value the role of the faculty.

Such beliefs, when combined with the faculty members' increasing orientation outside their college and university, have lessened faculty interest and involvement in the governance of American institutions of higher education and widened the gap between the administrative and faculty cultures in university governance. These two cultures must be bridged, to some extent, for American colleges and universities to remain true to their historic purposes and responsibilities.

Charting the Future of the American University and its Faculty

The modern American university faces formidable challenges that strike at its purposes and responsibilities, its quality and integrity, and its basic values. These challenges are grounded not only in the contemporary environment but, in a larger sense, in the development of a distinctly American vision of a university—a conception that places primary emphasis on direct contributions of the university and its faculty to the larger society.

American universities and their faculties need to ponder their missions, social responsibilities, and basic values—and to chart their own futures. They need not turn inward and dedicate themselves solely to learning and research for their own sake—

this would deny the enormous contributions of the university to the well-being of society and lead to the undermining of the distinctly American vision of a university. Rather than following their historic pattern of indiscriminately embracing society's seemingly insatiable demands, universities and their faculties should debate vigorously the ways in which they can make their most important contributions to society. Without such careful deliberation, the modern American university will lose its anchor.

Notes

[1]Richard F. Storr, *The Beginning of the Future: A Historical Approach to Graduate Education in the Arts and Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 15-29. *Note:* Many individuals have influenced development of this paper, but we have especially benefited from Derek Bok's *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University* (Harvard University Press, 1982).

[2]Alain Touraine, *The Academic System in American Society* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. 33-35.

[3]Hugh Hawkins, *Pioneer: A History of the Johns Hopkins University, 1874-1889* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960), pp. 3-20.

[4]Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 125-29.

[5]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976).

[6]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 129.

[7]Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 252.

[8]Rudolph, p. 266.

[9]Andrew D. White, Autobiography, Vol. I. (London: Macmillan, 1905),p. 341.

[10]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 118.

[11]Stanley G. Hall, "The University Idea," *Pedagogical Seminary*, 15:104.

[12]Veysey, p. 342.

[13]Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (New York: Sagamore Press, 1957); Abraham Flexner, *Universities, American, English, German* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930).

[14]Fred F. Harcleroad and Allan W. Ostar, *Colleges and Universities for Change: America's Comprehensive Public State Colleges and Universities* (Washington, DC: AASCU Press, 1987).

[18]Bernard Berelson, *Graduate Education in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Storr, 1973.

[19]Brubacher, p. 193.

[17]Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[18]Lotus D. Coffman, *The State University: Its Work and Problems* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1934), p. 205.

[19]Derek Bok, p. 62.

[20]Jacques Barzun, *The American University: How it Runs, Where It is Going* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 10-11.

[22]William C. DeVane, *Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 26.

[23]Lawrence E. Gladieux and Gwendolyn L. Lewis, "The Federal Government and Higher Education," *Higher Education in American Society*, Philip G. Altbach and Robert O. Berdahl, (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1987), p. 159.

[23]Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987); E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

[24]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968).

[25]Howard R. Bowen and Jack H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 3.

[26]Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 145.

[27]Bowen and Schuster, pp. 139-42.

[28]Ibid., p. 7.

[29]Clark Kerr and Marian Gade, "Current and Emerging Issues Facing American Higher Education," *Higher Education in American Society*, eds. Philip G. Altbach and Robert O. Berdahl (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1987), p. 146.

[30]David S. Tatel and Claire R. Guthrie, "The Legal Ins and Outs of University- Industry Collaboration," *Educational Record*, Spring 1983, pp. 19-25.

[31]Tatel and Guthrie.

[32]Tatel and Guthrie.

[33]Gilbert Fuchsberg, "Boston U. Gambles on Its Big Investment in Biotechnology Company," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 April 1989, p. A29.

[34]Gilbert Fuchsberg, "Universities Said to Go Too Fast in Quest of Profit from Research," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 April 1989, p. B29.

[35]Bok, pp. 136-58; Tatel and Guthrie.

[36]Bok, p. 142.

[37]Bok, p. 63.

[38]Harold L. Enarson, "Seminar on Dimensions of Integrity," unpublished syllabus for graduate seminar presented at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, March 23-27, 1987.

2

An Education For Every American Worker

Joseph M. Murphy

This may not be the best of seasons in which to talk about progressive or humane policy initiatives. The United States is undergoing an era of privatism and retrenchment. It has been eight years since California voters approved Proposition 13—and there has been no move to repeal it yet; six years since Ronald Reagan's first national landslide; five years since the great tax cut and the start of the defense buildup. These have been arduous years for all of us in higher education. For those of us who work for urban institutions, and whose constituencies are the socially or ethnically or economically disadvantaged, they have been disastrous.

The difficulty is not just that federal support programs are being cut back—or even that we confront a host of demographic and institutional problems that would have plagued us even in the absence of a hostile national Administration. The difficulty stems more from a crisis of confidence—a sense of self-doubt engendered by shortsighted national leaders, to be sure, but perpetuated by ourselves as we lose sight of our ultimate liberating mission in society.

We fight the adverse national political policies, and sometimes we win—but in so doing those of us who lead institutions or collections of institutions have fallen into what I believe is a destructive pattern of behavior. We engage in an almost pathetic attempt to justify our existence *in terms defined by our adversaries*. We try by economic calculation to prove that our benefits outweigh our costs. We try to show how much we add to something called the American capacity to compete in world markets, we talk about the multiplier effect of dollars spent on university-based research, and we talk about the savings we produce in welfare and prison costs.

What we fail to do is to explain to a dubious public why colleges and universities ought to exist. Our reason for being is not to turn a profit but to advance an ideal—and no matter how much time we have to spend convincing government and the leaders of corporate society that we represent a good investment,

we should never forget that what we offer is not designed to be amenable to the cash register method of determining social worth.

I want to discuss education for workers. In doing so I want to try to resist the temptation to be narrowly pragmatic; to some extent I want to talk about the vision that has guided these kinds of programs in the past and about the concepts that shape the programs we offer today. I do intend to suggest some steps that the government should and must take to encourage a broad national effort, and I want to answer briefly the questions of unions and academics about what's in it for us. But as I relate the vision to the program I want to try to keep prominent the issue of fulfillment of mission, not of return on investment: the attainment of a society in which fundamental knowledge, like fundamental power to control events, lies within the reach of every adult individual.

"Worker education" is a phrase with a radical ring, but the concept of education for working men and women is neither new nor revolutionary. There are programs at a hundred colleges designed to do that, and there have been efforts in this direction for many years. If we define education for workers broadly enough, it encompasses everything from continuing studies programs to job retraining to most of what we used to call "adult education." Such programs are valid and worthwhile, and there should be more of them. But even their staunchest advocates would concede that their impact is limited and that they represent at best a vastly watered-down version of what worker education programs were initially designed to be.

Essentially the "worker education" movement is an American permutation of a rather radical European invention. Many of you may be familiar with the programs that flourished on this continent in the first third of the twentieth century, such as the Johns Hopkins Workingman's Institute and the Bryn Mawr summer school for women workers. Efforts like those had their roots in programs abroad designed to break the back of a rigid

European class structure. Their British and Italian and French creators recognized that an ignorant working class was a class unequipped for social revolution; only with education would come an understanding of social and economic reality and a capacity to change that reality. The Old World worker movements were not oriented toward some value-neutral search for enlightenment; they were a prelude to political action. And there was more than a little of that here: at American Worker Education conferences in the early part of this century, delegates talked not just about teaching basic literacy and American civics to the final wave of immigrants, but about class struggle, class war, and worker self-government in industry.

To those of us with a sense of the romantic appeal of revolutionary rhetoric, those sentiments strike a responsive chord. And they fit nicely into our vision of what American life must have been like in the 1900-10 decade, when people debated Marxist theory as something more than an abstract intellectual concept, and when ideologies ranging from anarchism to social democracy competed for working people's hearts and minds.

Yet there were no major, successful, radical uprisings in the United States or Canada—at least none not eventually co-opted or defused. We must leave to historians the question of why not; for us, today, the relevant point is that the "worker education" movement, like the workers' movement of which it was a part, became in the late 1930s—if not before—something not very revolutionary and perhaps for that reason not very interesting.

By the New Deal years, what was called "worker education" had become a collection of programs run not for the masses but by and for unionists, designed to enhance unions' abilities to organize and to bargain. There was no formal link—with only the odd and quixotic exception—between American labor and higher education; few in either camp saw much community of interest. Unions existed to provide economic security, while universities were the province of the economic and social elite. We didn't educate their workers, and they didn't bother with our campuses.

All of this began to change in the years after World War II. In the United States the GI Bill took a giant step toward making higher education a reality. Inevitably, if slowly, the universities focused their concerns and curricula on nonelite causes and aspirations. Moreover, by the 1950s unions had become even more respectable bulwarks of the status quo—and the feasibility of linkages with such other bulwarks as the academic community became obvious. So at public and private institutions alike, programs in industrial labor relations began to reflect something other than management bias. Some colleges offered special training programs for union leaders. Some campuses organized.

But even then, not much was done in terms of formal, structured outreach efforts to educate working men and women. It was not that higher education rejected the concept; it was simply that our agenda was too crowded with other issues. The postwar era was a period when we stretched our resources to accommodate the baby boom generation—or at least the middle- and upper-class members of that generation. We cashed in on a public interest in research, and we made the megaversity a permanent fixture in North American life. That may have been about as much as one generation had the energy or the vision to accomplish.

But we ignored a quiet, growing need, and we ignored 40 percent of the population in the process. Mass higher education systematically excluded most of the people old-left theorists would refer to as the masses: a few blue-collar families sent their children to college, but the percentage never came close to the middle-class norm. People who had opted out of school in their teens were, as far as the academic community was concerned, out for good. For every adult learner in a community or senior college there were many who might have wanted to come but were kept away by fees, schedules, fears, or the oppressive realities of daily working life. Our ways of doing business were geared to middle-class values and middle-class habits, and we exhibited little interest in making ourselves more flexible.

Meanwhile, the working people excluded from educational opportunity were growing more disadvantaged in terms of their ability to survive on this continent with every passing year. At some point in the 1960s the typical American job became white-collar, and good white-collar jobs require credentials and degrees. The massive recessions that put millions of industrial employees out of work began in 1970. The growth economy that promised our parents that their children's possibilities would be unlimited became a historical artifact by the time of the first energy crisis in 1973. And through all this most of the underclass stood by powerlessly—unions fighting a rear-guard battle to avoid giving back what they had won through decades of struggle, unemployed workers struggling to understand what had happened and how to keep it from getting worse, minority community people trying to figure out why legal equality had not lifted more of them off welfare and out of the secondary job market. Few of the disadvantaged—far too few—made any connection between the reality of their lives and the realities of our political and economic system. How could they in the absence of any training in philosophy or economics or sociology or history—the things the old worker education radicals had wanted to inculcate in the working classes?

What we had created without realizing it was a system of class differentiation that suited powerful economic interests perfectly: a middle class technically trained to fill corporate needs but largely unconcerned about the philosophic underpinnings of corporate society—and a working class economically powerless and intellectually unequipped to ask why.

But we could afford to spend little time or energy worrying about that rather perplexing phenomenon; by the 1980s, we in academe had problems of our own. The recessions hit just as our traditional constituency started dwindling. Those students who came wanted skills that would lead to jobs, and if we would not offer that to them, they would go somewhere that would. Our status in society and our claim on society's resources had fallen mightily and continues to drop today.

Obviously we had failed—not to fulfill our primary mission of education and scholarship, but to communicate to a broad constituency our sense of an intellectual idea. We became by this decade, in too many cases, nothing more than miniature replications of social order's status quo: professional elite institutions for the wealthy, managerial training universities for the middle class, urban public vocational institutions for the ambitious and insistent among the poor. That was how the public and its elected representatives envisioned us. That was how many of us saw ourselves. And nowhere in this vision is there much concern about providing those who are most desperately in need with the intellectual tools that broadly based schooling in the nature of society and the nature of human life can provide.

Perhaps I castigate myself and my colleagues unfairly here: there were and are glorious exceptions to what I have just said. But my general contention is valid. The academic community has offered to society in general, and to working men and women in particular, too little and too late by way of intellectual advancement and of the resulting capacity to control social forces rather than be controlled by them. We have been too reluctant to utilize our resources in the kinds of cooperative and innovate ventures with unions and others who represent working people that would help us fulfill what all of us should recognize as one of our central purposes in being. From the point of view of simple self-interest, we have failed to capitalize on a market as important to us as we are to it.

I would like to think that we, at my own institution, have taken some steps to remedy that deficiency, and so, undoubtedly, have others. The City University of New York (CUNY) offers a liberal arts baccalaureate program, under the auspices of City College, at the Center for Worker Education in downtown Manhattan. There are now about 550 students enrolled there from the Communication Workers, the Teamsters, and other unions. What makes the program work is its orientation to people's schedules and interests, and a course structure that recognizes the actual needs of people who work eight hours a day, usually

have children at home, and desperately want a credential to improve the quality of their lives. (I say "credential" rather than "education" simply to recognize the fact that it is the degree rather than the course content that most working students say they are pursuing; in that sense, regrettably, they differ only slightly from most of our conventional students.) What makes it worth the effort is that we are not doing job retraining or upgrading employee skills to better serve the corporate/government economy; instead, we are giving these 550 people a basis on which to reevaluate the merits of that economy and their own role in it. That may not be what drew them to City University, but it is the most vital thing they take from us when they leave.

CUNY is doing other things involving workers—an associate degree program with the Teamsters at one of our community colleges, an adult literacy program for 3,000 workers from several unions, and even a master's program in urban management in conjunction with the Teamsters local that represents city analysts. These latter efforts are practical and vocational because they are what the workers want. But we guarantee they are not limited to that; we do not read aloud from Marx as we do the technical course work—as the early worker education people did—but we make sure there is liberal arts and social science content integrated into the operation.

Our experience with these programs has been short. But we know enough by now to say that they work—and for three reasons:

- They reflect a commitment to academic concepts and valid intellectual standards of academic content.
- They capitalize on what we have to offer unions and what unions have to offer us. We retain control over standards, curriculum, and selection and retention of faculty. On all other matters—scheduling, fee structure, publicity, and student recruitment—we work with the worker organizations and in some cases let them take the lead. The result is a collaborative effort in which all parties have a vested interest in success.

- We have mechanisms for evaluation to help us ensure that we are meeting the needs of our students, our union constituency, and our own institutions; we are willing to make modifications when we find that the program is serving something other than its stated purpose.

We can do more at CUNY—but the more important truth is that it is time for the academic community and the labor movement generally to begin to work and plan together for something much more universal. It is time for a set of coherent national policies that meet working people's needs and draw upon the education community's resources. It is time for government in the United States particularly—which has for five years turned its back on both colleges and on workers—to establish policies that help us help each other.

What I propose for the United States is a four-step federal program to make education for working men and women in America a viable possibility. It builds on a radical tradition, but it is reformist rather than revolutionary, and relatively low-cost. It does not solve all our problems, but it creates a foundation for a vigorous program for the future.

First, *Congress should open* **all** *federal financial aid programs to part-time students.* Technically, Pell grants and the loan programs are already accessible to part-time students. Realistically, they are not; the information about how to apply does not get transmitted, and the formulas are rigged to make it hard to establish eligibility. If we want to open education to working people, Congress must mandate that student aid is available to part-time students in practice as well as in theory.

Second, *Congress ought to ensure that any tax reform measure it approves provides an income tax exemption for employer-paid education benefits whether or not the training is specially related to the job.* This is a mobility exemption; it lets janitors train to be computer programmers if their companies will pay for it—and it gives unions a strong impetus to bargain for that kind of training in their contracts.

Third, *Congress should revise the counterproductive unemployment system regulations that most states impose to discourage people between jobs from getting anything other than job-related training.* Currently it is up to the states to decide which if any education programs are appropriate for people on unemployment benefits. Only rarely do they approve anything that is not focused on vocational skills. This means that the unemployed steel worker or clerk who wants to move out of a narrow life track that has dead ended cannot do so if he or she relies on unemployment to pay the rent. In a society that supports the idea of personal mobility, this is preposterous. We ought to want people to develop broader competencies and stronger bases of social understanding, and our policy should be to encourage unemployed people to do that.

Fourth, *Congress should approve a modest grant program for innovative and replicable adult learner programs*—for curriculum, planning, training and recruitment. We know intuitively that some things work and some do not—that job-site programs work for some kinds of workers, and others ought to be integrated into regular classrooms, that weekend courses serve some people's needs better than others, and that some people need highly specialized counseling while others can guide their own course. But there is far too little in the way of a formal body of knowledge to guide us.

These are modest proposals, simply setting the framework for action. The real responsibility for educating workers in the United States belongs not to Congress or to the Administration, but to us and to the people who represent the men and women in the ranks of American labor.

Some within and outside the union movement might ask, reasonably if narrowly, what really is in this for them. After all, educated union members may move up and out: remember, we live in a society in which personal upward mobility is still the preponderant economic dream. Unions struggle even now to retain their constituency; why should they support or fund

programs whose effect will be to place workers on a managerial or professional ladder?

Progressive unionists already know the answer to that. First, the organizations exist to serve their members and access to education is what some, at least, of their members want. Second, even those whose education credentials ultimately move them out of the bargaining unit will—we hope—always retain some of their working-class perceptions and values and as managers will be able to act upon them. Third, vacancies in union ranks will be filled with new hirees and avert the stagnation that some of the older unions face. And finally, most important, worker organizations that seek to advance a progressive agenda need members who understand enough of the social and political environment and of social and political realities of the past to know what progressivism is and can mean for us all. So there are valid reasons for unions to support massive education efforts.

But why should we? Those of us who are academics, and the people we represent, earned our degrees and got our appointments in a traditional system. Those of us who are presidents and chancellors stay where we are because, to a greater or lesser degree, we can articulate the best of the traditional values and can defend standards and selectivity as fundamental tenets of our professional life. Why should we expend time and political capital to educate those whom, to no personal or institutional detriment of our own, we have heretofore successfully and overwhelmingly ignored?

Enrollment shortages and funding declines provide a practical answer. But it is the wrong one.

Our true response is more complex but equally self-interested, since it pertains to the reasons for the urban university's existence as an essential element of contemporary society.

The public universities of our two nations exist today primarily and perhaps exclusively as the result of a protracted struggle toward equity and opportunity—an incremental struggle to include the excluded, to extend the benefits of a productive

economy to the children of immigrants and the grandchildren of the enslaved, to bring the intellectual capabilities of our culture to bear on the problems of our time. Our purpose in being is, as it has always been, not just to generate and disseminate knowledge to the few within our classrooms, but to serve as a resource and a potential avenue of advancement to the vast population outside our doors.

We can only prosper in a political environment that holds human liberation among its primary goals. In any other setting, as we have learned in this decade, we must battle just to survive. So it is incumbent on all of us, in fulfillment of our mission and defense of the climate in which we can exist, to battle for progressivism and opportunity, for innovative approaches to difficult problems, and for a better system that serves every member of our community. A campaign that will focus on education for working men and women, like past campaigns for minorities and the disadvantaged, will give each of us an opportunity to play the advocacy role so central to our purpose in being.

Education for workers represents a perfect priority item for the academic community's agenda. It is a concept whose time has long since come—and that helps us build and maintain bridges with old friends and new allies in and out of the labor movement. It serves a major constructive social purpose. It builds on an inspiring tradition. It enables us to offer the best that we have to men and women who may be among the best and more deserving on this continent.

3

The Socioeconomics Of The College Curriculum

David E. Lavin

Two of the university's vital roles have always been discoverer and conservator of knowledge. Though other societal institutions produce and conserve knowledge (for example, corporations and government), only for the university is this the ultimate aim. Professors are the ones who, through consensual processes, decide how to organize knowledge into units that can be taught. This organized structure is the *curriculum*. The authority of the university sanctions the curriculum and provides its legitimacy. In effect, the curriculum is the answer to the question, What is *legitimate knowledge?* It defines what is taught and what can be studied.

The realm of "legitimate knowledge" changes. The knowledge of earlier historical periods often gives way to that of subsequent periods, and one society's knowledge is another's myth. So, in a real sense, knowledge is mutable (that it often does not appear as such testifies to the university's authority), and definitions of legitimate knowledge are always subject to some uncertainty and conflict. Pressure for change flows from different sources.

Academic disciplines themselves are one such influence. After all, the content of various disciplinary fields changes constantly as a result of advances in research, innovation in methodologies, and the emergence of new intellectual currents and perspectives. Undoubtedly the rate of change varies by discipline (change typically occurs more rapidly in the sciences than in other fields) and by historical period.

Disciplinary developments have important implications for higher education curricula. Changes in the field bring about pressure to "keep up." Partly, this involves modifying existing courses to incorporate new material, and adding new courses. But measures do not occur spontaneously; they result from a second set of influences: social processes within the university and among academic departments.

In the typical university, divided into departments, the number of course offerings is constrained by an internal political

economy; for example, by the supply of students, by peaks and declines in the popularity of disciplines, and by the need to regulate competition among the department faculty. Courses cannot proliferate uncontrollably. Other things equal, new ones can be introduced only as older ones are withdrawn. Therefore, tinkering with the curriculum always carries the potential for conflict: when new courses replace older ones, they come to symbolize the ascension to legitimacy of new aspects of knowledge and the decline or loss of legitimacy of others.

In turn, these ebbs and flows reflect the changing fortunes of the faculty. For example, younger faculty (the ones most recently trained and thus most likely to have mastered new knowledge and techniques) may propose new courses or sequences of courses. This can sometimes produce generational conflicts within departments, as the power of younger, au courant professors rises while that of older, perhaps obsolescing ones wanes. Because the forces for change carry the potential for such painful disruptions of social and political status in departments, there is inevitably some lag between what is new in a discipline and what is taught at the university. There is an ever-present tension between the need for stability and the need for change. In this dialectic, questions arise about how to define legitimate knowledge, and what the educated person should know. Such questions may arise more often in some areas than in others; for example, more in social science and in literature and the humanities than in natural science; but arise they do in all fields.

Relationships among departments also influence the political economy of the curriculum. Though some departments feel intellectual kinship and others do not, they all participate in the competition for curricular survival. They compete with one another not only in obvious ways, such as budgetary, but also in subtle ways involving academic status. Consider what may happen when an institution reexamines such questions as:, what should the educated person know, and how much choice should students have in designing their educational programs? For

example, in the 1960s many institutions expanded student electives and whittled down required courses. Although these alternatives were often debated under different banners of educational philosophy and pedagogical principle, a covert but equally important status competition emerged: departments whose required courses became elective faced not only declining enrollments, but an erosion of their status in the educational enterprise—a devaluation of their contribution to what the educated person must know. There was, in short, a threat to their position in the domain of legitimate knowledge.

Teaching and curricula are influenced not only by developments in the field and by interdepartmental competition but also by the larger, more sweeping forces of societal change in the economy, in the social class structure, and in values concerning education. These forces may cause profound crises over what constitutes legitimate knowledge in the university. For example, consider the crisis that developed in nineteenth-century American higher education when the legitimacy of a "classical" education came under attack.[1] The core of the curriculum had been the study of Greek and Latin. Traditionally, the students of this curriculum were young men whose elite status was rooted in land ownership in a predominantly agrarian economy. But the opening of the American West, the transition from a predominantly agricultural to a predominantly industrialized society, and the growth of cities created a new class of wealthy industrialists and merchants who represented the expanding possibilities for individual achievement in a rapidly developing society.

Classical education hardly seemed useful to this emergent class or to public officials of the new states in the growing union. Enrollments at many colleges of the period reflected this trend. Thus the classics declined as the centerpiece of collegiate study. In their place came courses more useful to people interested in exploitation of natural resources and expansion of commerce in a developing nation. Modern languages, science (especially with an applied focus), literature, American history, and agricultural

technology acquired legitimacy in the emerging and increasingly popular system of higher education. Ultimately, profound changes in the economy and the social structure led to profound changes in the curriculum of American colleges.

One may imagine that faculty debates during this period took on an apocalyptic tone as older conceptions of legitimate knowledge gave way to the advance of the new interests and new needs of an emerging elite having the economic and political power to affect the material well-being of colleges. The dramatically new curriculum set by faculties (usually strongly influenced by college presidents and trustees), would seem inconceivable were it not for the massive changes occurring in American society.

In the twentieth century, fundamental social and economic trends have continued to alter the landscape of American higher education. One of the century's most visible developments has been the unprecedented growth in the educational attainments of the population. In 1900 only 6 percent of young Americans graduated from high school.[2] By 1970 more than 75 percent had, a figure that has remained stable into the 1980s.[3] Increases in the proportions of the younger age groups entering colleges have also been dramatic. Around the turn of the century the proportion of college goers was not high, since so few graduated from high school. At midcentury 20 percent of the age group went on to college, and by the 1980s that figure had more than doubled—to more than 45 percent.[4] In terms of numbers of students, growth has been vast: in a period of twenty-five years the number of undergraduate students more than tripled from 3.25 million in 1960 to more than 11 million by 1985. This upward leap in the numbers of college goers had major effects on institutions. Between 1960 and 1985 colleges and universities grew from just under 2,000 to 3,340—an increase of 67 percent.[5] To summarize, then, the United States has undergone a spectacular transition from elite to mass higher education. In the proportion of the traditional college-age cohorts entering college, it has far outdistanced other nations.

One of the driving forces behind this growth has been the dramatic shift in the economy from goods to services, or the transition to a postindustrial society. In this transition, low, unskilled, and semiskilled jobs have sharply declined while highly skilled professional, technical, and managerial jobs have grown. Educational requirements have been rising accordingly. One researcher estimates that, based on changes in occupational skill levels between 1940-70, jobs requiring four or more years of college increased from 8 to 22 percent, while those requiring less than a high school degree declined from 29 to 15 percent.[6]

Other factors have also fueled higher education's growth. One is "educational inflation": as more and more people have acquired educational credentials, there has been escalation in the educational qualifications required for entry to many positions in the labor market, even in cases where the functional requirements of the jobs themselves have not increased. Demographic factors have also contributed to educational expansion—the baby boom, for example.

As a result of these long-term trends, especially the upgrading of occupations, the life opportunities of individuals were becoming more closely tied to their educational attainments. In particular, a college degree rather than a high school diploma was becoming the minimal educational qualification for access to better jobs (gauged by income, work conditions, and possibilities for career advancement). Partly because of this linkage, access to higher education became a major issue in the 1960s, a decade of intense national preoccupation with and conflict over issues of equal opportunity in American society. Though college attendance had been growing enormously, different class, racial, and ethnic groups continued to have very different chances of attending. Higher education became a major arena of egalitarian efforts. In the early part of the '60s, the federal government intervened in the South to begin the desegregation of higher education. And in tune with a national declaration of a "war on poverty," part of the effort to achieve the Lyndon Johnson

Administration's "Great Society," federal programs, especially in the financial aid area, aimed to lower barriers to higher education for disadvantaged people and ethnic minorities. At the same time, many colleges and universities initiated programs to expand the enrollment of these groups that had been greatly underrepresented in higher education.[7] In effect, the values climate was becoming more favorable to a conception of higher education as a right for all rather than a privilege for a few.

These developments not only spurred expansion in the number of college entrants; they also led to change in the socioeconomic profile of the student population. The enrollment of minority students swelled, almost erasing the gap separating their college-going rates from those of whites: in 1960 the rate for black high school graduates was 75 percent of whites'; by 1975 it reached 99 percent of the white rate.[8]

Change also occurred in other important ways. The enrollment of women grew markedly. The average age of the student population increased as the proportion of students older than twenty expanded. Indeed, there was greater participation of even older groups, such as those over thirty-five. Students who attended part time were a steadily growing segment of the college population, increasing from just over 30 percent in 1970 to 42 percent by 1985.[9]

In comparison with the traditional college-going population, the new students more often came with deficiencies in the basic academic competencies—reading, writing, and mathematics skills. As a result, remedial programs emerged in most colleges and universities, even at the most selective institutions.

How were these new kinds of students distributed over the system's diverse types of institutions? Chart 1 classifies institutions according to the degree of selectivity of the admissions process and to the source of funding as primarily public or private.[10] The model of the Type 1 school is the great public university such as the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin. Though

primarily state funded, their status as national universities is reflected in the geographic diversity of their student bodies, especially in their graduate students. Admissions requirements are stringent, particularly for out-of-state applicants. Type 2 schools also have the status of national institutions; they are extremely selective; if anything, even more so than the Type 1s. They include the elite private universities, such as Harvard, Stanford, and the University of Chicago, as well as many smaller colleges such as Swarthmore, Reed, Wesleyan, and Oberlin.

Most of the public colleges and universities are Type 3 institutions. Similarly, most private colleges are Type 4. Both types tend to draw local or, at most, regional student bodies.

Public, low-selectivity institutions (Type 5) have in some ways been the most important development in American higher education over the past thirty-five years. These are generally the low-cost community colleges, with two-year courses of study leading to associate degrees both in vocational subjects and in liberal arts. The latter is generally considered to be a track connecting two-year graduates with four-year colleges and baccalaureate degrees. These two-year institutions have been by far the most rapidly growing segment of the higher education enterprise.[11]

As one might expect, given their low cost and open-door admissions policies, the community colleges have absorbed more of the new students in higher education than has any of the other institutional types. Nonetheless, these students have been distributed throughout higher education in ways that depart from what conventional wisdom might suggest. In the 1960s, their representation increased especially where one might least expect it: in the elite tier of institutions—at the Harvards, Stanfords, Michigans and Berkeleys. Because of the status of these institutions, their efforts to diversify the ethnic composition of their student bodies drew wide national attention.

These changes in the student body played an important role in influencing conceptions of legitimate knowledge and,

hence, what should be taught in the university. But to detail this process, it is necessary first to take into account a second major theme of American life in the 1960s—the controversy over the Vietnam war.

The war marked a turning point in the political role of the university in American society. Universities became one of the most important centers of opposition to the war. A major event accelerating this process was the "teach-in" movement that began at the University of Michigan in the mid-1960s. In effect, higher education had become a site of activism, attempting to bring about change in national policy—a posture that had a deeply rooted tradition in the higher education systems of other societies but not in the United States. Though opposition to the war is commonly thought to have been student-driven, faculty were crucial catalysts in this movement. Many academics marched arm in arm with their students. Of course, university-centered opposition to the war was hardly monolithic. In some ways universities gained from involvement in the war effort. Some academics played important roles as consultants and advisers to the government. Indeed, some of the architects of the government's war policy came directly from academe. Many universities received funding to pursue government-sponsored research related to the war. For example, major research on chemical defoliation agents was conducted at the University of Pennsylvania, an undertaking that touched a raw nerve among faculty and student pacifists.

Controversy in the wider society reverberated throughout higher education and led to a questioning of assumptions usually considered essential to social consensus and stability. Key among them was the faith that experts actually possessed expertise, and that officials at the highest levels of government could be trusted to inform the public truthfully. But as events unfolded, it appeared to many that officials deliberately misled and that experts provided assessments that were, at best, misguided. As a result, a deepening skepticism began to develop about the legitimacy of

authority. This skepticism came to focus not only on the authority represented by government, but also upon that vested in the university, including its authority to define the content of legitimate knowledge.[12] What was to be taught, how students were to be evaluated, and how the curriculum was to be organized came under examination.

In this process of self-scrutiny, the other motif of the 1960s, the intense national concern over racial, ethnic, and gender discrimination dovetailed with the developing suspicion of authority. When minorities pressed their claims for greater access to higher education, it became clear that equality of opportunity meant more than merely being allowed to pass through the gates. For earlier generations whose children first made their way to college—that is, for European immigrants to America—access alone was deemed a sufficient opportunity.

But new students of the 1960s were not so grateful. For American blacks and Hispanics (at least those from Puerto Rican origins), there were other items on the agenda. Key among them was the demand that the value of their cultural heritages be recognized. This demand materialized in a number of ways. Professors were denounced as cultural imperialists, representing a tradition of knowledge and scholarship that had only European roots. Universities were called upon to broaden their perspective; that is, to incorporate black and Hispanic traditions as part of the authorized body of legitimate knowledge. Minority students demanded representation among faculty, ethnic studies departments, and ethnic studies majors. The content of these studies covered a range of disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Sometimes African languages were offered. An alternate model for ethnic studies called for dispersing the proposed courses through the established departmental structure. So, for example, in the music department courses in jazz would take their places beside those on the baroque, and classes on black writers would be offered in English departments.

Though such course additions were sometimes made within the traditional departmental structure, that approach was not typical. It was not favored by minority students and carried the potential for conflict within departments. Faculty members disagreed on what courses should be added: some faculty did not believe that ethnic studies courses were academically legitimate or that new courses should be added for "political" reasons. Adding to the difficulties were potentially explosive disagreements about "merit versus quotas" that were raised by the prospect of including racial and ethnic criteria in hiring faculty to teach the new courses. Partly because of these conflicts, and partly because popular sentiment favored a university curriculum that reflected a multicultural society, the most common solution was to establish new ethnic studies departments. This solution appeared responsive to the demands of minorities for a curriculum reflecting their heritages, it provided an avenue for hiring minority faculty, while at the same time it left the traditional departments and their programs largely unaltered, at least with regard to curricular content.

The forces that contributed to the legitimation of ethnic diversity in the curriculum helped prepare the ground for another major intellectual current: women's studies. Feminist critiques often focused on the role of scholarly work in reinforcing the legitimacy of male privilege (for example, the literature of that period includes many studies of gender differences in psychosocial development that are interpreted in sexist ways). These critiques have had powerful intellectual effects on the university. Women scholars, bringing a feminist perspective to many disciplines, have influenced the content of the social sciences, the arts, literature, and the humanities. In this sense women's studies have reverberated throughout the curriculum, undoubtedly more successfully than ethnic studies. Perhaps this is because the academic women who have been on the cutting edge of feminism, both as a political movement and as a scholarly perspective, have come from higher social classes than is typical of those who were

advancing claims for the intellectual legitimacy of ethnic studies. In social origins and cultural background, the academic feminists are similar to those white male academics with whom they have sought to share power.[13]

One might say that societal concern about authority and equality focused attention on all ascribed statuses and a rethinking of their influence on intellectual work. Thus, *social class*, though hardly a new concept, is being used to broaden disciplinary perspective. This trend has been especially evident in historical research. For example, American history has largely chronicled the actions of elites—of those with great power. One large-scale project, underway at the City University of New York, has been developing American history from the perspective of the working class. Project directors hope to disseminate the materials nationally for classroom use in college and universities. In such ways, the themes of the '60s have been quite broad in their effects.

Before the upheavals of the '60s, there was in place at most colleges a kind of core curriculum in which every student, regardless of major, was required to take courses in social science, natural science, and the humanities, the latter including arts, languages, literature, and philosophy. In tune with the times, questions arose about the legitimacy of these requirements. According to a popular view, there were many paths to knowledge and different individuals could be educated in different ways. Eroding was the idea of a core of substantive knowledge defining the well-educated person. For example, most colleges had been requiring two years of a foreign language. In the 1960s and early 1970s, after intense and sometimes bitter faculty conflict, many institutions dropped these requirements. The resultant curricula left much wider latitude for student choice. In effect, students (often with the counsel of faculty advisers) could construct programs tailored to fit their interests and aptitudes.

Less substantive and more pedagogical changes also swept across the departmental terrain. The use of grades in student evaluation was deemphasized. Many colleges instituted

pass-fail grading systems. Second, in traditional grading systems, faculty members began evaluating students more permissively, distributing more high grades and fewer low ones.[14]

The sources of the pass-fail option and grade inflation are not so clear. Partly, they may have stemmed from the more culturally diverse student body: if greater student diversity raised questions about the dominance of European culture in the curriculum, did it not also raise them about the criteria used in student evaluation? Was there really a single academic standard that should be applied in assessing academic performance? And in line with the idea that the American university should play a more critical role in society, some were scrutinizing higher education's influence on the process of social selection. The grade-point average was a major steppingstone to status and success, determining who would aspire to further education, who would be accepted in graduate school, and who might be hired by employers. Therefore, some faculty members considered grades a key perpetuator of social inequality, a belief that led to lenient and pass-fail grading.

The results of all this change are not easily assessed. The intense focus of the 1960s and early '70s on inequalities of ethnicity, class, and gender has had enduring effects on disciplinary developments in the social sciences, literature, and humanities. Modifications in course distribution requirements are still in place; that is, there is more latitude in the choice of courses than there was before the 1960s; but some movement in the direction of added requirements has occurred. Evidence also suggests that faculty grading behavior is somewhat less permissive than it was.

The establishment of ethnic studies departments has had mixed consequences. On the one hand, their creation provided a sense of legitimacy not only to the presence of minority students on campus, but also to their histories and cultures. These departments have undoubtedly furnished many minority students with a critical base of support, both intellectual and emotional, in academic settings where they often feel estranged.

And for minority faculty, ethnic studies have been by far the major point of entry into campuses to which access was difficult or impossible. But there is a downside. Ethnic studies departments tend to be segregated socially and intellectually: their enrollments are dominated by minority students; minority faculty tend to be concentrated in them. Ironically, this segregation of minority faculty has allowed institutions to meet affirmative action goals while at the same enabling traditional departments to avoid serious efforts at hiring minority faculty. Also, the segregation of ethnic studies has undoubtedly diminished the chances of nonminority students' exposure to courses that would broaden their understanding of ethnicity in American society—an understanding which, arguably, should be a part of the educated person's intellectual repertoire in a pluralistic social system. In short, though probably not possible in the Sixties, the model of establishing ethnic studies throughout established disciplinary departments would, over the longer haul, have brought about wider participation.

By the 1980s the developments of the Sixties had come under vehement attack. The most widely known example of the counterreaction is the critique of the contemporary American university by Allan Bloom, a humanities professor at the University of Chicago, whose book, *The Closing of the American Mind* occupied the bestseller lists for many months, and has probably sold more copies than any other book about education ever written by a bona fide academic. This work has an apocalyptic quality, describing the proliferation of elective courses and additions to the curriculum as an expression of a mindless relativism that threatens Western Civilization, or, at least, American society. Bloom views most of the current intellectual trends—revisionist history, ethnic studies, deconstructionism—as fads he hopes will pass. What he sees as the most serious threat is the emphasis on cultural relativism—on the idea that the tenets, assumptions, and perspectives of traditional Western thought do not necessarily deserve a more central place in the curriculum than more

recent work representing other perspectives. He appears to advocate a return to a core of classic works, starting with Plato and Aristotle, rooted in the tradition of Western thought (and, I note, written by males). In effect Bloom denies that the changes in the curriculum and in the teaching enterprise over the past twenty years represent legitimate knowledge.[15]

But this denial raises other questions. Who decides what is knowledge and what should be taught? If the process of defining legitimate knowledge is not a social process, then what is it? Is higher education immune to societal changes in the status of groups that stake their own claims about what should be studied and what should be taught? The university has always needed to respond to such claims, though in responding it need not be merely a passive reflector of wider social forces. It is itself an agent for molding and directing the claims of the newer clients.[16]

In the 1960s the university both responded to and helped shape attitudes about two dominant issues: the legitimacy of authority and socioeconomic inequality. Attitudes about these issues influenced who attended college and created a crisis about what constitutes legitimate knowledge. The changes that resulted did not resolve that crisis; they only heightened it: the legitimacy of the curriculum is always subject to question, and faculty are not so insulated from social change as the stereotype of the ivory tower suggests.

Notes

[1]The discussion that follows draws from Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636.* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1977).

[2]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States. Colonial Times to 1970.* Bicentennial Edition. Part 2, (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 379.

[3]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1984* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 158.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid, p. 141.

[6]Russell W. Rumberger, "The Changing Skill Requirements of Jobs in the U.S. Economy," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 34:578-90.

[7]Probably the best known of these programs was the open-admissions policy initiated in 1970 by The City University of New York (CUNY). In the broadness of the access it created, in its baccalaureate focus, and in its effort to provide support services to underprepared students, this policy was, arguably, the most ambitious egalitarian effort in American higher education (for assessments of outcomes, see Lavin, Alba, and Silberstein, 1979, 1981; Lavin, Murtha, Kaufman, and Hyllegard, 1986).

[8]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1987* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986), p. 137. This figure is less impressive than it appears since high school graduation rates for blacks remained below those of whites. Since 1975 minorities have lost ground in college entry.

[9]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1988* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987), p. 141.

[10]Some mixed funding hybrids such as Cornell do not seem to fit, but the overwhelming majority do.

[11]Between 1960 and 1975 their numbers grew from a little more than 500 to more than 1,100—an increase of 117 percent. Looked at another way, they grew from about a quarter of all institutions in 1960 to 37 percent of the total by 1975. In terms of student enrollments, they accounted for 13 percent of all undergraduates in 1960, 27 percent in 1975, and currently they hold 40 percent of enrollments (Bureau of the Census, 1983, p. 161; Bureau of the Census, 1987, p. 141).

[12]The most famous and, probably, most influential of the attacks on the university was the Berkeley student revolt. Media coverage was intense, and the incident likely served as a prototype for conflict on other campuses.

[13]Women's studies has also developed an interdisciplinary status at some institutions; that is, by putting together course programs from different disciplines and departments, students have been able to earn the baccalaureate with a major in women's studies.

[14]Arvo E. Juola, *Grade Inflation, 1960-1973: A Preliminary Report* (East Lansing: Office of Evaluation Services, Michigan State University, 1974); Malcolm G. Scully, "Crackdown on 'Grade Inflation,'" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 22:1,12.

[15]Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

[16]Part of its active role is seen in the growing diversity and stratification of the higher education system itself; for example, in the emergence of the two-year community college in response to the growing numbers of persons with aspirations for education beyond high school.

4

Faculty Governance: Old Wine In New Bottles

Carol J. Guardo

An increasing number of indicators on the national higher education scene in America point to a resurgence of interest in faculty governance. They range from the anecdotal to the empirical.

Faculty and administrators on campuses large and small, old and young, public and private, across the country report a renewed attention to faculty governance. Discussion is increasing on the need for and desirability of more faculty involvement in the governance of colleges and universities. Faculty of earlier generations recount with nostalgia a time of collegiality, common purpose, and shared governance, which campus communities are now trying to reestablish. The success of the first-of-its-kind national symposium on faculty governance held in April 1989 provides further evidence. And scholars of the subject report that academic senates are coming out of their doldrums and revitalizing themselves.

The simple and compelling conclusion is that faculty now want more participation in the decision-making processes of their institutions.

In 1986, Bowen and Schuster published their seminal work on *American Professors*. They chronicled the deterioration in the condition of the nation's faculty and the decline in their morale. They reported that there was at least the perception of an erosion of faculty autonomy and participation in institutional decision making. Contributing to this condition were such factors as the increased size of institutions, the broadening scope of the higher education establishment, growing centralized control of institutions, and, particularly, the increased incongruity between the bureaucratic structure of academic administration and the collegial structure of the faculty.[1]

> According to another observer:
>
> Campuses both large and small are moving away from communities of shared values and interests and are becoming complex bureaucracies governed from the top down by administrative elites. . . .

> Universities are losing their collegial atmosphere and their cultural distinctiveness.[2]

These attributes of collegiality and cultural distinctiveness have already been lost, or at least significantly obscured, on our campuses. And it is precisely the sense of loss of something valued that is prompting the attempts to find or reestablish a vital faculty role in governance. However, these efforts are occurring in new times, in changing institutions, and amid new social pressures. Thus, the current movement to revitalize faculty governance is a case of putting old wine into new bottles—an attempt to recapture a sense of collegiality, fuller participation in institutional life and decision making, but under changed and changing conditions and in new forms.

Several factors have been advanced as keys to understanding the present state of faculty governance and what might be needed to foster its resurgence and assess its future prospects. This discussion focuses on one of them: the perceived and actual changes that have occurred in the American academy over the last three decades. These changes constitute the most potent impact on faculty governance, an impact that has created the compelling need to put old wine into new bottles.

Factors of Change in Faculty Governance

The changes that have taken place in the American academy over the last thirty years are the most salient for gaining insight into the resurgence of interest in faculty governance today. In the late '50s, professors were poorly paid but enjoyed far more public esteem than is the case today. These were years when faculty had a clear and discernible voice on their campuses, particularly in regard to academic policies and curricular matters. They were the years just prior to the great expansion of the American higher education system that took place during the

decade of the '60s, and prior to the halcyon days of growing enrollments that necessitated the building of many more campuses.

Then came the golden years of expansion—years of high demand and low supply of professors, when mobility from institution to institution was the order of the day. This is a time that, not coincidentally, most of today's American professoriate remembers, given its average age.

These prosperous years were followed by the late '60s and early '70s and all of the events, emotions, and experiences these evoke. These were times of antiestablishment sentiments, some of which were virulently directed against the academy itself because it was part of the so-called establishment.

During this period, many American campuses experienced considerable tension and turmoil and instances of student activism. Many faculty, especially younger ones, joined student causes and championed their positions. Consequently, not only were curricula rewritten to allow more student choice and self-definition, but so too were governance bylaws rewritten to open the processes to students as well as other nonfaculty constituents.

Faculty senates became university-wide governing bodies in which issues both academic and nonacademic were debated and voted by faculty and nonfaculty constituencies alike. Thus began a process of dilution of faculty power and authority; issues formerly perceived to be the province of faculty were thrown open to the campus community.

During this period another significant event took place besides the not-to-be-forgotten protests of the Vietnam War and civil rights marches. In 1965, a statute was passed in the State of Michigan that allowed public employees to organize and bargain collectively. Several other states followed suit in subsequent years. This development positioned faculty at public institutions to respond with unionization to the first phase of falling enrollments and the retrenchment of faculty and programs on

some campuses in the early '70s—the years during which most faculty unionization took place.

Unionization brought a new element to governance: a sharper distinction, and sometimes separation, between traditional academic issues and those of faculty welfare. The wine was now being divided, with some being put into new bottles fashioned by faculty contracts while some remained in the old.

Faculty welfare issues became the province of the unions, which addressed wages and fringe benefits, working conditions, and processes for grieving administrative decisions, especially those concerning tenure and promotion. Traditional academic issues were typically left with the faculty senate. Issues included the design of the curriculum, course subject matter, instructional methods, requirements for degrees, research, faculty status, and aspects of student life related to the educational process.

These issues were clearly articulated areas for which faculty had primary responsibility in the 1966 "Statement on the Governance of Colleges and Universities" jointly promulgated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards.

On many other campuses, retrenchment issues led to more visible and systematic involvement of faculty in matters of institutional planning, financial forecasting, and budgetary allocations. Besides having a role in selecting department chairs, they had more and more of a role in selecting top academic administrators—deans, provosts and presidents. Thus, the dilution of the faculty's role in governance matters, resulting from the addition of students and nonfaculty to faculty governance, was partially offset by increased faculty involvement in larger institutional concerns. The involvement of faculty in institutional matters was so great in some cases that it formed the basis and rationale for the famous Yeshiva decision handed down in 1978, which ruled that faulty were "managerial employees" and thus not eligible to organize to bargain collectively.

These conflicting developments, combined with increasing emphasis on balancing good teaching with good scholarship, led to an overall decrement in faculty involvement in governance and institutional matters and more withdrawal into professional activities—a pattern of response that carried into the early '80s. During this current decade, the academy has undergone further noteworthy and noticeable change in the way it operates, in faculty roles, and in the roles of administrators.

Faculty perceive that new demands and values have been placed on teaching, scholarship and service. As the Carnegie *Faculty Survey* reported, they also have concerns about professional security, of compensation levels, and the academic integrity of their institutions.[3]

Administrators, for their part, also perceive changes: new demands and shrinking resources, more regulations, more bureaucracy, more competition for students, and more privatization among faculty—that is, the tendency to be less involved in the business of the institution and more withdrawn into teaching and scholarly pursuits.

For both groups, these are not merely perceptions but realities. The roles have changed and are still changing. Faculty have turned more and more to their own concerns; administrators have been drawn more and more into nonacademic matters. In some cases, each has blamed the other for the unwelcome aspects of these changes. In some cases, they have drifted along parallel and then increasingly divergent paths that are less and less related. In rare cases, both have capitalized on these changes as an opportunity for building a new sense of common purpose, new modes of communication, and new forms of shared governance.

In order to foster a return to faculty governance characterized by the active and meaningful participation of faculty in the affairs of colleges and universities, the academy must face several challenges and anticipate the major issues of the 1990s and twenty-first century. Can collegiality and a sense of common

purpose characterize relationships between faculty and administrators? Is collegiality more achievable with nonunionized faculties? What issues and trends can lead to greater involvement in faculty governance in the years ahead?

Factors in the Revitalization of Faculty Governance

The time has come to begin to put the old wine of collegiality and common purposes into new bottles or structures of governance sensitive to and shaped by changes in the academic profession over the last three decades. It will take far more, however, than just changing the reward system for community service or participation in faculty governance, as has been suggested by many. It will take, among other things, concerted efforts by both faculty and administrators to create conditions of civility and collegiality.

What, however, are the conditions that foster collegiality? A spate of stories in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* over the last few years has caused many observers of faculty governance to wonder aloud if all sense of fairness and civility has been lost on campuses. Instance after instance of the vilification of presidents has been grist for the journalistic mill despite objective perspectives exonerating these administrators from their alleged faults or misdeeds. Yet those who note the rise of interest in revitalizing faculty governance argue that "through their senates, faculties can provide forums where civility and elegance can be restored to public discourse and where volatile issues can be carefully considered."[4]

A return to civility is vital to establishing collegial modes of governance on college and university campuses. If the academy does not do something soon, it will lose its essential values. These values are the very ones that drew faculty and administrators alike into the academy in the first place: intellectual honesty,

collegial problem solving, objectivity, tolerance for differing points of view, disagreeing without being disagreeable, and debating without destroying the dignity of others...and, the highest value of all, the pursuit and sharing of knowledge in ways that ensure the integrity of the developing intellectual maturity of students.

In order to see these values held high once again, the academy must put aside the remaining vestiges of antiestablishment sentiment, emerge from private activities and reengage in the campus community, and refocus concern on the educational and academic.

It is interesting to note that the resurgence of interest in faculty governance follows a period in which faculties were challenged and called upon to reform curricula in response to several reports critical of the state of higher education. These reforms, which only faculty could conceive, design and implement, such as those in general education curricula, have given faculty a proper stage on which to raise their voices and play out their rightful role within the academy. It has even been argued that "from a faculty perspective, collective bargaining can strengthen shared governance by specifying and assuring the faculty role in institutional decision-making."[5]

For their part, academic administrators have not been insensitive to the widening gulf between them and faculty and have begun to try to reconcile the values of a management approach to the business of the institution with a collegial approach to faculty participation in policy making. They have recognized the crucial elements needed to rebuild collegial foundations for shared governance and have begun exercising them.

The elements include: (1) increasing the availability of relevant information on which to base decisions and courses of action, (2) shaping a framework in which consultation occurs early in the decision-making processes and reciprocal communication continues throughout them, (3) working diligently to facilitate group deliberations and problem solving, and (4) articulating a set of shared values and goals in an atmosphere of mutual

respect with the intent of achieving consensus on fundamental premises for the governance of the institution.[6]

As both groups—faculty and administrators—strive to revitalize and raise the value of faculty participation in governance, they also need to look ahead to the issues of the 1990s. Anticipating and preparing for the challenges of this decade can strengthen and stabilize shared governance. Among the several issues likely to be in the forefront, two stand out: the increasing diversification of student bodies and the need to replenish faculty ranks depleted by retirements and a diminishing supply of doctorally prepared faculty.

Both of these issues strike at the core of the missions of institutions, which require for their fulfillment that sufficient numbers of able faculty be available to engage in the interactive educational process with more diverse student groups. This, in turn, will probably require the rethinking and redesign of many curricula, a task clearly in the province of faculty, but one that will need whatever support and resources administrators can secure to make these desirable ends feasible.

In the last analysis, these fundamental issues will require the combined expertise, dedication, and commitment of faculty and administrators working toward common ends. Together they must pick up and shoulder the casks of old wine: the precious wine of collegiality, shared governance and common purpose. Together they must deliberately and deliberatively fashion new bottles: the structures and processes of new modes of governance. And together they must carefully pour the old wine into the new bottles so that the interests of all those who would learn and be educated in the years ahead can be served.

Notes

[1]Howard R. Bowen & Jack H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled.* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[3] Richard M. Levinson, "The Faculty and Institutional Isomorphism," *Academe*, 1989, 75:23.

[3]Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1984 *Faculty Survey* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987).

[4]Joseph G. Flynn and K. E. Markoe, "Faculty Governance: A Case for Reinventing the Wheel," *AAHE Bulletin*, 41:4-9.

[5]American Association of University Professors, "Statement on Academic Government for Institutions Engaged in Collective Bargaining," *Academe*, 73:25.

[6]Carol E. Floyd, *Faculty Participation in Decision Making: Necessity or Luxury?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8 (Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985).

5

Momentum, Not Miracles: The Need To Embrace Technology In The Classroom

Peter J. Cayan

Ecclesiastes says that "to everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heaven; a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted."

There is a time to change, there is a time to understand, there is a time to be creative, and there is a time to survive in higher education.

There has been enormous change in the way structure and university leadership relate to the campus and classroom. The progression of technology has amassed such momentum that it cannot be denied. The scope of advancement is so imposing that it commands attention and action. The vested interests are so pervasive that only an approach determined unemotionally and realistically can adequately embrace all concerns.

What are the implications of these changes?

We reside in a technological environment, and a serious disparity seems to be evolving that could be termed *awareness shortfall.* No matter how we relate to technology, either individually or collectively, the need to acquire knowledge of technological culture has become compelling. To begin to understand the essence of technology is to be better able to respond to change.

We have been, and are now, experiencing rather extensive educational change and adjustment. How can we educate better, faster, and more efficiently? This question implies that what we were doing in the 1960s and '70s was acceptable and if we get better at it, we'll be all right through the 1980s and '90s.

The great French philosopher and poet, Antoine de Saint-Exupery, once wrote, "When it comes to the future, the task is not to foresee it but simply to enable it." Therein lies the challenge.

In living with change, some of us sometimes find a welcome opportunity, and others of us find a threatening upset of the old ways of doing things. Many have the notion that change is taking place somewhere else; therefore, "It doesn't affect me." If change is to be one of the centerpieces of survival, then we must construct an environment within which it will be understood and properly

ED

managed. Inasmuch as many of us find change difficult to accept or even to acknowledge, we hasten to adopt strange notions as norms.

But allow me to urge you to listen to the noise and the silence. Society is screaming out at us, "Change!" Institutions and organizations are seducing themselves into believing that past success can fit the situation. It has been suggested that ignorance gets us into trouble and arrogance keeps us there. Change knows no season. Too often, past success sets the condition and becomes the necessary forerunner of future failure. Yesteryear is precisely that: a portion of what has been, a time frame on which the present stands, and from which the future hopefully extracts the best.

The structure of higher education has undergone changes that will significantly alter the college and university landscape.

We live in a world in which the key time frame is the future and the survivors will be those who can sort it out. The strategic resource has become *information—imagination.* The revolution taking place in society today is a revolution *about* information. It is a revolution that recognizes the pervasive value of information.

Dr. Herb Simon, professor of computer science at Carnegie Mellon, university, says that "we think of revolutions as being sudden events producing far-reaching changes in a very short period of time. But the revolution launched by the steam engine took, by any reasonable account, 150 years."[1] New technologies build on older ones. Each mental revolution produced during the time of a new technology adds to the human experience. The communications revolutions have, therefore, been cumulative rather than substitutive.

It is said that "tradition without revolution is empty; but revolution without tradition is blind." The person, not unlike the purposeful organization, who continues to live on past successes and practices, without regard to changing social and technological structure, will probably lose purpose, vitality and usefulness. On the other hand, to force change without regard to past

experiences, both successes and failures, without recognizing the subtleties of past adjustments, without sensitivity to tradition, is to ignore the need for internal coherence and orderly creative growth.

How to move forward between these two extremes is indeed a central issue. There are traditions and behavior that have proven useful and effective and are supported by those who find them both sensible and comfortable. Conversely, there are mounting pressures from various constituencies for radical changes that can be made only by ignoring or eliminating many past practices by which we impart knowledge in classrooms and laboratories.

To follow either calls exclusively is dangerous: one leads to gradual decay, the other to chaos. If the integrity of learning lies in service, a means must be found of accommodating these divergent views. It is important to ensure continuity while also recognizing that we must neither ignore the future nor back into it.

Perhaps Ortega y Gasset was correct when he claimed that "human life is a constant preoccupation with the future."

What implication, then, do these principles have for determining future classroom teaching methods?

People thought that radio and TV would transform the classroom, but not much happened. As Harvard University President Derek Bok has explained: "Experience should also make us wary of dramatic claims for the impact of new technology. Thomas Edison was clearly wrong in declaring that the phonograph would revolutionize education. Radio could not make a lasting impact. Television met a similar fate in spite of glowing predictions heralding its powers to improve learning.

In each instance, technology failed to live up to its early promise for three reasons: resistance by teachers, high cost, and the absence of demonstrable gains in student achievement."[2]

If, on the other hand, we believe the new information technology is most promising, our confidence may be well placed.

F. D. Fisher provides several major reasons, perhaps the most important being that the new information technology permits the learner to *interact* with knowledge. When students can relate to the subject matter as individuals, computer-assisted instruction can be custom tailored to personal learning styles.

Technology has enhanced our ability to improve pedagogy because computers permit us to collect better data about the ineffective methods students sometimes use. We will be able to better understand the pathology of learning, which can help teachers improve instruction.

The rapidly changing environment in which students learn and teachers teach will not allow us to indulge in procrastination. The demand for more structured and declarative responses from higher education will test our patience, our willingness to change, and push us to the limits of relevance.

The long-range effects of technology on the classroom cannot all be foreseen, but early signs hint at what is coming.

The student of today has been growing up with the tools of technology. We all marvel at the miracles of flight, worldwide satellite transmissions, lifelike robots, and the magic of computers.

The once-acceptable and practiced rote of yesteryear has become the routine of today, and may be the genesis of tomorrow—unless the tradition is updated. But to merely enhance current practices of teaching does not go far enough. New instructional designs are required to keep pace with education and social reforms. Curricula and teaching practices should shape the environment. Educators have a responsibility to confront technology by assuming an attitude of curiosity and aggressively pursuing professional growth. Some have a "tell-me-exactly-what-you-want-so-I-can-tell-you-why-I-can't-give-it-to-you" attitude. Still others are handicapped by perception: "If the only tool you can use is a hammer, then all of the tasks look like nails."

Education can improve society. Information technology can improve education.

We must teach technology to our students in the most advanced way possible. And their training must give them a clear understanding of the work place and employers' expectations. Uninspired instruction, obsolete equipment, and outdated curricula will not give students that kind of preparation.

Pogrow contends that the only way to expand the curriculum under conditions of constrained resources is to use the very technology that is creating the need for expanded services.[3]

The contemporary professor is discovering that only through constant management of the curriculum can technology complement the instruction process without overintruding upon a learning environment in such a manner as to inhibit rigorous inquiry.

Teachers today too frequently use monologue as their only teaching method, and computer instruction too often mirrors that approach. To use Perelman's well-known phrase, "Technological education treats students as if they are members of a universal audience and use an identical cognitive style."[4] This teaching style does not encourage interrogation; students only record knowledge without getting a chance to actively analyze it. Methodology may reduce ambiguity, but it also reduces the need to learn how to *think*.

Learning is more than mastering skills, accumulating facts, and applying memorized responses. Knowledge does not endure unless it is accompanied by intellectual curiosity, and students' excitement in investigation depends partly on the "nourishment" they get from their educational surroundings.

If we are to put real technology in the classroom, then we ought to establish clear definitions. There has been a great deal of confusion over what is *technology* and what is *high technology*. And if we have high technology today, what do we have tomorrow—*very* high technology? Therefore, a simple description for *technology* might be "the application of scientific principles to solutions of everyday problems"—in other words, applied science.

If one subscribes to the belief that our institutions are today in the midst of a noteworthy cultural revolution—that is the advance of technology—then it follows that we must accept the computer as the banner of that revolution. This formidable and instructional research tool by which data are converted to information has become an immeasurable force. However, unless the teacher is objective about and open to its use the hardware will not be used to its best advantage.

The approach-avoidance syndrome usually accompanying the advent of any new technological innovation has been especially apparent in the case of the computer. Only the knowledgeable teacher is well-positioned to discern the pros and cons of introducing computers into the classroom.

The numerous arguments supporting and opposing the computer are not idle whims. The challenge is how to minimize fears and maximize confidence.

Computers are not going to be a *surrogate* for education. They are going to affect education, but they won't *substitute* for it. What is important is that they will inspire creativity and interactive learning.

So where is the computer revolution? Not in the kitchen, but in the mind.

The potential of the computer is only limited by our imagination. Our test will be not whether we require people to bend to the technology, but whether we can make technology bend to the requirements of the people. Computer software will have to be designed with *people* in mind—not to replace them, but to allow them to relate to machines in much the way they relate to one another.

In the Middle Ages, one feature that attracted students to a particular center of learning was the privilege of sitting at a professor's knees. Today, the learner sits at the knees of the computer. We are putting into place a new kind of instructional relationship that allows teacher and learner to interact with a machine having extraordinary access to information. Technology may emancipate, but it does not replace personal human inter-

action between student and teacher. The learner's opportunity to have a meaningful experience through the collective interaction of the class will be subject to occasional compromise.

Does the computer diminish the enrichment of interaction between the instructor and the student? Some believe that it may add a barrier isolating teacher and learner because of the almost addictive effect of the computer on the student and heavier demand for involved program preparation by the teacher.

Another concern is that computers may gradually cause faculties to place too much emphasis on problems and methods that lend themselves to programming, while giving less attention to matters that are qualitative and speculative.

Might one then conclude that the flood of technology imposes on us as never before the imperative of preparing an individual to assert the freedom of the mind to explore itself, to express itself, and to connect with other minds in the quest for truth? We must remember that machines and processes are only tools: they do not provide an environment in which emotional exploration and reflection can occur. The classroom is becoming an incubator for a restructured teaching profession. Although the computer is not expected to replace human interaction, its place as an important addition to the environment is profound.

Merely "adding on" technology to ordinary, traditional practices will not suffice. We must not only resolve how to incorporate technology into the curriculum, but also to discover how it will be *managed*; therein lies the test: coordinating the interactions of instructor, student, curriculum, and technology.

Technology will demand of students and professors new training, new and perhaps unusual behavior. The changing job market calls for new standards by which teachers' and student's performance will be measured—that is, *added value* and *outcomes*.

Computer-based instruction requires teachers to *anticipate* student response more frequently and precisely, which requires more preparation time. But teachers also need time to

write or change programs, conduct research, teach, advise, participate in campus governance, prepare for class, and develop professionally (through conferences, seminars, sabbatical leaves, publishing, and speaking). It is vital that a faculty be free to question old thoughts and search out new ones.

If curriculum is a factor of job-site demands and an instructor's judgment, how might an authentic case study play itself out? How does the classroom teacher today respond to the avalanche of electronic intrusions in a responsible way?

A self-selected group of faculty at the State University of New York College of Technology, Utica/Rome has commenced to root the delivery of its curriculum in the technologies. This endeavor has dramatically affected instructors' preparation and presentation of course work. Teaching methodologies have changed because of new realizations and an eagerness to change. Faculty recognize the power of computers, computer-aided design, and computer-aided manufacturing, and satellite transmission teleconferencing. They also acknowledge the commitment of time necessary to apply computer innovation to teaching. Their comments reflect this new awareness:

> •My students who have been working with computer-aided design software are enthusiastic and enjoy working with the new system.
>
> •The use of computers, CAD/CAM, uplink/downlink is becoming an important technological resource and a powerful tool in today's teaching, though it is dependent on the nature of the courses and type of curriculum.
>
> •The various uses of technology at the college have had an impact on the style and content of classroom instruction.
>
> •By observing faculty prepare lectures for distance learning, I noticed that there were some unexpected by-products. First, the faculty had to organize lectures in a very orderly fashion. Due to the nature of

distance learning, the faculty had to stick to the prepared lecture in order not to lose the class's attention. Second, the faculty would use the classic learning model to teach; tell the class what you were going to teach them, teach them, and then review what you taught them. In both cases the faculty became better teachers and the students benefited from their better learning.

•I feel the computer's impact in the traditional English curriculum, where the writing process has become virtually automated.

•In my view, one of the biggest contributions of the attempts to integrate technology into the educational process is that it forces us to stop and reconsider our objectives and methods.

•With all of the options available, it is difficult for most novices to make an informed choice in the selection and evaluation of media. Again, education and training play a major role in helping teachers know how to choose the media and methods best suited to the attainment of well-defined objectives.

Within this sphere, faculty performance rests on how teachers proact and react to technology. There may well be occasions when the well-prepared student will test the teacher's level of sophistication. Another matter of assessment involves decisions on promotion, tenure, etc.

A noteworthy transformation has been underway in this arena, too. Those colleges and universities that are "well-futured" understand the necessity to realign curriculum with technology and *attitude*. If the objectives of creating and disseminating new knowledge are to be achieved, we must be open to innovative instructional technique. The extent to which the instructor energizes and controls the classroom environment for the student will be determined by an awareness of available technology, a

desire to adapt it, and receptive students who are sufficiently prepared.

There are no other reasonable choices. It will be difficult, but a bold orientation to technology will extract from us the best of the old and the new.

If we aspire to be the best, then we must prove to ourselves and others that we *are* the best. Let us not treat lightly the intellectual expectations of the student, for that is the critical juncture where truth prevails, and where good judgment predominates.

Perhaps we need to think about a form of our own *peristroika* (restructuring). Each of us must take on a rare kind of foresight—not just to respond to change but rather to anticipate it. We must create a compelling vision of a desired state of awareness. We should be concerned about our university's basic purposes, why it exists, its general direction, not with nuts and bolts, not with doing things right, but with doing the right thing. The litmus test of accomplishment will be performance, and to that end, our self-imposed challenge is before us. The quest should be for momentum, not miracles.

Few will argue that we should have high hopes for high tech. Few will deny that high technology constitutes a new frontier of opportunity and a sort of "wild card." Few will dispute that the coming educational transformation promises unprecedented change. Few, if any, would disagree with the caveat that a restructuring of our classrooms and curricula is needed. The advance of technology is unrelenting. Information exchange is intensive. Can our institutions afford to miscalculate?

We need to move to that level of knowledge at which we will know that we don't know, and we will be willing to push ourselves to the very edge of reasonable risk in search of excellence.

Emerson wrote, "This time, like all other times, is a very good one, if we but know what to do with it."

Over the entry of the National Archives in Washington, D.C., is engraved the inscription, "What's past is prologue." The

tale is told of the tourists who were arriving at the door of the building; as they started to leave the cab, they noticed the wording. Turning to the cab driver, they asked, "What does that mean?" The driver replied, "It means, you ain't seen nothing yet."

Perhaps, we ain't seen nothing yet, either!

Notes

[1]Herb Simon, "Designing Organizations for an Information Rich World," in *Computers, Communications, and the Public Interest*, ed. M. Greenberger (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971), pp. 37-63.

[2]Derek Bok, "Looking Into Education's High-Tech Future," *EDUCOM Bulletin*, Fall 1985.

3 Stanley Pogrow, *Education in the Computer Age: Issues of Policy, Practice, and Reform* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983).

[4]D. Perelman, *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1979).

[5]James L. Barnes, "Learning to Solve Tomorrow's Problems," *The Technology Teacher*, March 1989.

[6]David L. Goetsch, "Understanding High Technology," *The Technology Teacher*, March 1988.

[7]Harold G. McMullen, "The "Well-Futured" College: Reaching for Tomorrow—Today." Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Paper, Vol. 3, No. 2. July 1985.

[8]Gene L. Roth and Dennis G. Teslowski, "Technology Curricula and Instruction in the Information Age," *The Technology Teacher*, September/October 1986.

6

Idealistic and Pragmatic Reasons For The Importance Of Faculty Research And Scholarship

Judith A. Sturnick

American colleges and universities are a diverse group of institutions, each with its own history, size, scope, and mission. Even we the institutional members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities vary immensely. We are small, medium, and large in enrollment; rural, semirural, suburban, and urban; residential and nonresidential; primarily undergraduate and comprehensive degree-granting through the doctorate; traditional and experimental; possessed of long and short histories. For some of us, faculty research and scholarship is a major endeavor that not only attracts intentionally renowned faculty members but also serves as a magnet for federal and private grants; for many of us, however, the highest priority is classroom teaching, with research and scholarly productivity secondary, as is true of my campus, Keene State College (NH).

My campus is typical of many other public colleges: moderately sized, public, residential, located in a semirural area, and founded originally as an institution for teacher training. Although we offer four graduate programs at Keene State, we are primarily an undergraduate institution, and most of our 4,300 undergraduate students are enrolled in baccalaureate programs. Most of our students are the traditional 18-20-year olds, but we have a rapidly growing population of adult learners over 25. We now define ourselves in our mission statement as a comprehensive liberal arts college, since currently only 20 percent of our undergraduates are enrolled in teacher education.

As a result, our institution—again, like so many other public campuses—emphasizes teaching and teaching effectiveness as the priority use of faculty time. Consequently, faculty performance evaluations for tenure and promotion rest primarily on evidence of vigorous classroom performance. We reward meritorious teaching not only through promotion and tenure, but also through annual designation of a Distinguished Teacher Award.

Nevertheless, even at undergraduate institutions such as ours, the ultimate criteria for effective teaching and learning must always be faculty vitality and renewal. As pedagogical studies and

research on effective teaching clearly indicate, there is a direct connection between faculty professional development/revitalizing activities and a stimulating learning environment in the classroom. This, indeed, is the main reason our college encourages faculty research and scholarship. We have come to believe, as the empirical evidence confirms, that faculty members' intellectual curiosity manifests itself in their efforts to remain up to date in their field. Requiring current knowledge of research and scholarship maintains a spirit of inquiry both in and out of the classroom.

We speak a great deal on our campus about the value of "the life of the mind." But such an intellectual life requires an insatiable curiosity about new knowledge and new facts, an infinite desire to reinterpret and to rethink one's scientific and/or critical positions, as well as a desire to discover new information or new interpretations of established knowledge. The faculty member who continues to learn and to be inspired brings that inspiration into the classroom and thus kindles students' imagination.

Voicing this notion that the true teacher must also be a true scholar, one of my colleagues uses the phrase "the endlessly questing mind." Perhaps I need to draw a distinction here between scholarship and published research. Some of our most innovative and creative teachers read voraciously and constantly try out new theories, philosophies, critical approaches in their classrooms; but they publish sparingly—sometimes they do not publish at all in refereed journals. However, it is the pursuit of knowledge and excellence, not publishing, that infuses the classroom environment with that intellectual fervor which, once unleashed, will never be quenched in the lives of our students.

I am reminded of two companion poems by poet Matthew Arnold. He presents just such a vision of the intellectual quest as an end in itself in "The Scholar-Gypsy" and "Thyrsis." In the former, he extols the scholar-gypsy as "waiting for the spark from heaven to fall."

Thou had'st one aim, one business, one desire. . . . .
thou possesses an immortal lot,
And we imagine thee exempt from age. . . . .
For early didst thou leave this world, with powers
Fresh, undiverted. . . .
Still nursing the unconquerable hope.

In "Thyrsis," he writes:

Still, still these slopes, 'tis clear,
Our Gypsy-Scholar haunts. . . .
Know him a wanderer still. . . .
A fugitive and gracious light he seeks,
Shy to illumine; and I seek it too. . . .
Yet on he fares, by this own heart inspired.[1]

The dedicated teacher in pursuit of intellectual truth, "by his own heart inspired," carries that illumination into the classroom. In a similar fashion, if Keats can believe that "a thing of beauty is a joy forever," then certainly the creation of intellectual beauty through the exchange of ideas and the discourse of "true minds" is as immortal and significant as the creation of a work of art or a great scholarly piece. Within the framework of a contemporary undergraduate institution, the creation, recreation, and renewal of intellectual energy and intellectual curiosity are ends in themselves—worthy enterprises to be valued and honored for the infinite significance they hold for finite human minds and for the lifelong intellectual journeys we all undertake, to one degree or another. Implicit herein is the concept of an *educated person.* In the long run, the educated person is capable of probing intellectual analysis, of critical thinking, of revelatory synthesis, of original intellectual response. More than this, the educated person imparts that intellectual energy and originality to others, either through formal teaching or through informal discourse.

The importance of faculty scholarly vitality to teaching and learning is expressed in an anecdote the Greek scholar Edith

Hamilton told about one of her fellow professors at Columbia University. One day after class her colleague was conversing animatedly with a student who had stopped to ask a question. Caught up in the enthusiasm of his ideas, he was eager to share his excitement with the student. At the end of the conversation, as the student started to leave, she suddenly turned back to him and blurted out: "Oh, Professor, you so much enjoy your own mind!" That is why faculty research and scholarship are of primary importance today—because, whatever else those components may produce, they must first of all ignite in students an intellectual fire that allows them to know and enjoy for the whole of their lives the pleasure of their own minds. These are truly educated persons.

The teaching and learning vitality generated through scholarship and research is not, however, limited to the classroom. Every campus has its own ambience, which may range from apathy and inertia to intellectual electricity. The extent to which individual faculty members and the faculty as a whole engage in scholarly and intellectual renewal also determines the general intellectual energy of the campus. The greater the faculty involvement in the world of ideas and intellectual discovery, the more expansive will be the academic culture of the entire institution.

A second reason for the importance of faculty research and scholarship: such activity hones self-discipline. That may appear to be a strange function to assign to faculty intellectual efforts; perhaps, as a representative of an American campus, I may be more sensitive to this issue than are my European counterparts. However, in my country we frequently lament the loss of any standards of discipline in behavior or in intellectual activity on our campuses. Not only are our students in great need of disciplined role models, but so also are our colleagues and ourselves. A commitment to continued intellectual growth and development, a willingness to put forth the energy and effort required for continued study and learning, the dedication needed

to pursue the elusive fact or intellectual theory, the desire to translate art and learning into life and experience for our students and colleagues—all of these efforts require immense self-discipline, as well as a disciplined desire to elucidate this learning. The productive scholar, who is also the productive teacher, validates the essential human symmetry of discipline of life, mind, and action. And that discipline, too, is an aspect of the educated person. As Wordsworth noted in his sonnet, "Nuns Fret Not," mental chaos is not liberation; true freedom is to be found in creative and intellectual order.

A third reason for the importance of research and scholarship in the contemporary university pertains to curriculum development. The new scholarly disciplines and areas of scholarship have opened up vast new areas for research during the past half-century. We have seen the emergence of such fields as American literature, sociology, social work and clinical psychology, women's studies, black studies, and ethnic studies. These new fields present boundless new knowledge to be created, formulated, written about, debated, and taught. As a result, the impact of faculty research and scholarship upon the shaping of the undergraduate curriculum is immense. New courses, new fields of concentration, new majors, and new programs of both undergraduate and graduate study emerge to take a rightful place within the pantheon of older, more established academic disciplines. The new and the old vie for attention from both scholars and students. The undergraduate curriculum is thus revitalized every five years as the cycles of new scholarship become an accepted part of the literary, philosophical, historical, and theoretical canons of academic disciplines. As it should be, curriculum development continuously regenerates intellectual curiosity by raising new questions and generating new answers or approaches to old questions.

All of the preceding justifications for the importance of faculty research and scholarship are essentially idealistic. Yet

there is also a pragmatic reason. While acknowledging the merit of pure scholarship, I must also acknowledge the value of quality faculty publications. To the extent that faculty scholarly pursuits result in publications, such productivity enhances the academic reputation of the contemporary college or university. Granted, we live in a time when the significance of faculty publications may be overestimated; too often, a faculty member and colleagues may judge professional worth on the basis of a lengthy bibliography including, of course, the prerequisite books produced at five-year intervals. Nevertheless, one cannot deny that an institution's academic standing is frequently affected by the breadth and richness of faculty publications, and an institution's reputation for excellence attracts the best teachers and students, which in turn enhances quality. Excellence breeds excellence by bringing together the best of the questing minds. If an institution builds its academic reputation soundly upon the foundation of quality research and substantive publications by its faculty, then that institution ensures both its intellectual and financial future. In the best of all possible worlds, this approach results in a marriage of the ideal and the pragmatic, because the institution that promotes faculty research and scholarship benefits both tangibly and intangibly. Such an institution attracts a degree of immortality in an ephemeral world, as does the intellectual tradition it sustains.

Consequently, faculty research and scholarship remain critical to the present and the future of contemporary colleges and universities. Even for undergraduate campuses such as my own that emphasize teaching, faculty scholarship enriches the campus climate, intellectual life, mission, and vision. As Matthew Arnold says in *Culture and Anarchy*, "We must find some notice for culture . . . a desire after the things of the mind simply for their own sakes and for the pleasure of seeing them as they are—which is, in an intelligent being, natural and laudable." For, as Arnold goes on to say, when such an intellectual culture is achieved,

"There is a national glow of life and thought, when the whole of society is in the fullest measure permeated by thought, sensible to beauty, intelligent and alive."[2]

Notes

[1]Matthew Arnold, *Poetical Works*, ed. C. B. Tinker (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

[2]Matthew Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. R.H. Super (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967), p. 112.

93

7

Faculty As Boundary Spanners: Responsibilities External To The Campus

William R. Monat

Higher education literature abounds in writings on traditional faculty roles within colleges and universities and their responsibilities concerning curriculum and faculty personnel processes, defining and maintaining academic standards, and participation in shared governance structures. The focus on faculty roles in shared governance has sharpened in recent years and was the subject of a National Symposium on Faculty Governance sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education in April 1989. In the keynote speech, President Stanley Ikenberry of the University of Illinois observed that faculty involvement in university governance is not a new phenomenon and that college and university faculty members in their teaching, research, and service roles for the most part define the environment, indeed the very character, of their institutions.

Faculty also define their institutions through *external* roles and responsibilities. This theme has received increasing attention and was the subject of a recent international conference on "The Role of the Future University" conducted at Hanyang University in South Korea in May 1989. Professor Clyde J. Wingfield, a Senior Fellow with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities during 1988-89, stated at that conference what most faculty in American public colleges and universities take almost as a given: that "the university exists within society and can no longer be a self-contained ivory tower, if indeed, it ever was." This observation is particularly true for the more than 300 institutions represented by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Unfortunately, many observers who review and frequently criticize higher education and who should know better too often see faculties merely as performing essentially campus-based and internal duties fulfilling the conventional institutional missions of instruction, research, and public service . . . or to put it more succinctly, creating and disseminating knowledge. In reality, however, faculty responsibilities are not so simple. In the special jargon of organizational theory, faculty serve in many ways as

"boundary spanners," negotiating with and providing services to the community. These boundary-spanning roles, moreover, are usually rooted in conventional duties within the boundaries of the university.

The external or boundary-spanning roles and responsibilities of faculty can be grouped into two general but not mutually exclusive categories: (1) those assumed by individual professors as representatives of their academic disciplines and professions or growing out of their scholarly achievements, and (2) those integral to or extensions of their campus roles and responsibilities. It is easy to see how these two forms of faculty contributions can merge; many professors would be hard pressed to fit their particular activity into one category.

Individual Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty are frequently invited or seek opportunities to perform services for organizations external to the campus, tasks that are outgrowths of their disciplinary expertise. In so doing, they usually do not represent the college or university but undertake assignments for which they are particularly qualified. The variety and frequency of these opportunities varies widely from institution to institution and from discipline to discipline. Faculty at a campus with a clear research mission or with established professional schools (such as law, business or engineering) are likely to be more in demand for external opportunities offered by government agencies, corporations, financial institutions, and specialized governmental or private research laboratories than are faculty at an undergraduate liberal arts campus. At three of the universities with which I have been affiliated—The Pennsylvania State University, The City University of New York, and Northern Illinois University—faculty members in accounting, finance, marketing, and management information systems in the business school, those in the so-called "hard

sciences," applied sciences, and professions enjoy greater access and opportunity to work with external organizations than do faculties in the fine arts and humanities.

For example, my colleagues at Northern Illinois University in the colleges of business, engineering, and education, the departments of physics, chemistry, biological sciences, computer science, psychology, public administration, mathematics, geology, and geography find outlets for their professional skills advising or consulting with local, state, and national government agencies, and with private-sector organizations such as financial institutions, science and technology-based manufacturing corporations, research and development companies, and international agencies such as the World Bank. Within one hour's distance from campus are two of the nation's major government-supported research laboratories—the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory and the Argonne National Laboratory—and science professors pursue research projects with colleagues at these specialized institutions. Similarly accessible and used is the Bell Research Laboratory, also within one hour's distance. Faculty research programs relying on collaboration with external research facilities are quite common at many public universities and in most instances are an extension of the professors' personal research agenda, pursued both on and off campus.

Consulting and advisory roles also tend to be extensions of the professors' continuing research and scholarship. Usually the same disciplines and professional fields that provide the basis for research activities are those providing consulting opportunities. Unlike research, however, consulting and advisory roles are often not as clearly extensions of the professor's research agenda. Even so, consulting opportunities provide faculty with access to information and technologies that advance their research capabilities. Indeed, my own consulting with federal and state agencies has resulted in professional publications that would not have been possible without the access to data and the "on-line" observations of public-policy implementation. Most colleges and universities

observe a conventional limitation on consulting activity of no more than one day a week, a rule frequently stipulated in institutional governing policies. Prior approval is occasionally required. These constraints on outside activity are in most instances interpreted quite liberally, and therein lurks the possibility of abuse. Although professors may not go to the extreme of regarding their campus offices as answering services, both university administrations and professors need to recognize the prior claim of institutional responsibility over consulting opportunity.

Such external research and consulting activities are often encouraged by college and university administrations for several reasons. They enable faculty to keep current with latest developments in their respective disciplines and to provide access to new technologies and knowledge that enrich faculty teaching and research performance. They cultivate a receptivity on the part of external organizations for future university initiatives. They tend to create greater employment opportunities for graduates of the institution and to advance its reputation with those agencies, corporations, and companies. These relationships also can and do lead to formal contractual arrangements between the university and the external organizations for research, training, and technical assistance projects.

Not all professors in those disciplines and professions for which consulting and research opportunities exist find ready external acceptance. In most instances those faculty who engage in external activities have established external visibility through more traditional scholarship and creative performance. In short, academic reputation tends to facilitate access to external opportunities which in turn lead to expanded research, consulting, and even scholarly outlets for the faculty involved. It should also be obvious that college- and university-initiated external research, consultation, and training projects depend largely on the availability of qualified and recognized faculty strength and performance. Institutional entrepreneurship often depends on the extent and quality of faculty entrepreneurship.

Individual faculty external roles take forms other than research, consultation, training, and technical assistance. But even these other roles rest on the external visibility and academic reputation of the faculty involved. An important external faculty role exists in what might be termed a validation, evaluation, and certification function. Individual faculty members serve as disciplinary representatives on regional and specialized accreditation teams reviewing, evaluating, and certifying other colleges and universities or specific academic programs and units. Colleagues of mine, for example, have served on specialized accreditation teams for the American Bar Association, the American Association of Law Schools, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, the American Psychological Association, The American Chemical Society, the American Library Association, the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Other colleagues have been members of regional accreditation teams such as the North Central Association and the Middle States Association. In many states including Illinois, public school teachers require certification by state teacher certification boards, which include, among others, professors from teachers' colleges.

In much the same vein, individual faculty serve occasionally as disciplinary representatives on foundation and government committees or boards reviewing grant and other funding applications, prize nominations, and fellowship awards. The National Science Foundation, the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, Fulbright, Guggenheim Awards Committees, and many others rely on committees consisting of faculty from different institutions to review and make recommendations for granting fellowships, scholarships, and other awards. Review panels are also convened by some government agencies for the purpose of

evaluating the safety, honesty, and propriety of industrial products and services, panels that often include recognized academic experts.

There is, finally, a general disciplinary and service role individual faculty occasionally undertake. They serve as officers and committee members for national, regional, and even international professional associations. They are invited to sit as regular members of boards of directors or trustees of private organizations ranging from not-for-profit human services agencies to profit-making institutions and corporations. They frequently are called on to offer testimony as expert witnesses before legislative committees, government agencies, and judicial bodies.

It should be apparent, therefore, that the external roles and responsibilities of individual college and university faculty members are numerous and varied. In these roles they do not function as designated representatives of their academic institutions, but as persons recognized for their own knowledge and competence, as experts who can make contributions to organizations beyond the campus boundaries.

Although not as frequent as these diverse consultative, advisory, service, and testimonial roles, full-time service with government, foundation, and corporate organizations also attracts individual faculty members. These assignments are usually undertaken on a leave of absence without compensation from the individual's academic institution. As one who has twice taken on this kind of external role as an executive assistant to the Governor of Michigan and budget director for the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives, I can attest to the value of this kind of service both to the individual and the organizations served. These roles range from my rather modest activity to those of more illustrious academicians such as Henry Kissinger, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Harold Brown, John Kenneth Galbraith, and Walter Heller.

Institutionally Based Responsibilities

Increasingly, college and university faculties function as "boundary spanners" as part of their campus-based responsibilities. Some of these roles have a tradition longer than those that have emerged during the past twenty-five years. For example, faculty have traditionally generated self-studies to meet the requirements of both regional and specialized accreditation. The most recent regional accreditation self-study at Northern Illinois University was executed by a special campus committee chaired by a senior faculty member working closely with the university provost. Specialized accreditation self-studies are typically conducted by a departmental or school faculty committee. In some states, including Illinois, colleges of education not only must meet the requirements of the National Council on Accreditation for Teacher Education but must also be certified by the state department of education. In both instances, however, the required self-studies must almost of necessity fall into faculty hands with appropriate college administrative participation. In most American colleges and universities, faculty generally have primary control over the curriculum, student admissions and academic evaluation, and graduation requirements. Faculty must also play the central role in peer evaluation of faculty performance. These matters are always key concerns in both regional and specialized accreditation decisions.

Although organized faculty research also has a long-standing tradition in institutions with an explicit research mission, that role has become increasingly salient on those campuses. Organized research and individual faculty research, scholarship, and artistry are often difficult to distinguish and frequently overlap. Individual faculty members, as observed earlier, often seek and obtain research contracts from foundation, government, and private-sector sponsors. Organized research involving teams of university scholars or special research centers has increasingly become an important link between the campus

and its environment. Such research endeavors have expanded since World War II but it should not be forgotten that the Harvard School of Business, through a research contractual relationship with the Western Electric Corporation, undertook the groundbreaking applied research on employee motivation at the corporation's Hawthorne plant in Chicago in the late 1920s. The American land-grant universities for over a century have been involved in problem-oriented applied research and technical assistance serving American agriculture. These models for organized research provide a rich and successful legacy. The opportunities for applied research linkages between state colleges and universities have emerged since World War II in ways that permit university professors to work closely, often directly, with government agencies, corporations, and not-for-profit organizations to address policy, administrative, and scientific problems. These efforts usually, but not exclusively, take the form of contractual relationships between institutions and external sponsors.

Organized research activities in certain disciplines are conducted through or by campus-based research centers that provide faculty with opportunities and resources to conduct applied research for contractual sponsors. The variety of such centers is almost boundless and reflects the disciplinary diversity, specializations, and strengths of the faculty. Thus, depending on the faculty critical mass, there can be social science research institutes, business research bureaus, public administration and public policy institutes, applied engineering research centers, and an infinite variety of science research centers and even centers for humanistic and fine arts scholarship. These units provide faculty with rather specific research and development agendas and linkages with external sponsors, governmental and corporate, that need applied research. Organized research centers also undertake pure as distinguished from applied research efforts, usually supported financially by federal grants and contracts with the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other major federal funding agencies.

Whether the research agenda is "Big Science" or "Small Science," the university-based research facility is one major avenue for faculty external relationships.

In certain scientific fields, interuniversity consortia have emerged in recent years bringing together the faculty strengths of several institutions in a specific research focus. This form of interinstitutional collaboration usually involves major research universities, but increasingly opportunities have opened up for public universities with specific faculty scientific strengths.

Some states such as Illinois have cast higher education as a major actor in state-initiated and funded economic development efforts. Illinois, for example, has funded technology communication centers, small business development centers, and specific economic development technical assistance and applied research activities at both public and private universities. Illinois, in addition, has provided financial support for the creation and maintenance of a statewide databank of university faculty expertise in consulting, research, training, and technical assistance that can be accessed by any organization seeking to match a special need with a faculty expert.

A somewhat analogous set of relationships has evolved with respect to faculty leadership and participation in continuing professional education, technical assistance, and degree-granting "contract" courses and programs, all resting on contractual linkages with governmental, not-for-profit, and for-profit organizations. State colleges and universities have for decades relied on faculty leadership and participation in undertaking these external activities. And in most instances, programs and projects of this variety, while contracted for through the university, are faculty inspired, faculty designed, and faculty conducted.

Continuing professional education is typically of a noncredit, nondegree character and may consist of short courses, workshops and seminars, or extended intensive instruction. Sponsors working with university faculties will specify the educational needs and often work jointly with faculty in designing the

programs. The contracting sponsors range from financial institutions and corporations to state, local, national governmental, and not-for-profit agencies. My own experience has involved such diverse external organizations as the Peace Corps, The Agency for International Development, federal cabinet level agencies, state governors' offices, state personnel agencies, state police and public health agencies, local government associations, foundations, and interinstitutional consortia. As the so-called shelf-life of professionals becomes ever more limited in time, the needs for professional continuing education will grow and provide faculty and institutions with significant external opportunities and responsibilities.

Technical assistance has also become an emerging external faculty opportunity and responsibility. Peace Corps Training projects have been continuing responsibilities for my university since 1962 until the present. The World Bank has also sought out faculty colleagues through contracts with the university for participation as consultants or project supervisors in its Third World development programs. Contractual relationships with both public and private sponsors have involved faculty in disseminating their knowledge and expertise in addressing pressing governmental and corporate problems and needs. The ability of a college or university to undertake such technical assistance is similar to its ability to pursue continuing professional education: both depend on the imagination, competence, and commitment of the faculty to assume those responsibilities.

Contract courses and occasionally contract degree programs also bring professors into a direct service relationship with contracting governmental and private-sector sponsors. Specific credit-bearing courses and degree programs contractually provided for a specific governmental or corporate sponsor, frequently on site in the sponsor's facility, represent an emerging challenge and responsibility for faculty. Although at present these programs tend to be generated by public school systems, some corporate sponsors and not-for-profit agencies, the potential

poses institutional challenges. The courses and degree programs are usually delivered for a specified and limited clientele through a university-sponsor contract providing for full-cost recovery.

Organized research and training, technical assistance, and contract courses and degree programs tend to be extensions of the faculty's traditional instructional, research, and public-service responsibilities. During the past 25 years a very different external role for college and university faculties has emerged. It has in many respects been imposed on the faculty from external sources but is growing out of the established faculty jurisdiction over curriculum and academic standards. It is also a responsibility most faculty have assumed with reluctance and only after persistent administrative prodding, a responsibility grudgingly accepted precisely because it is recognized as one that forces the institution and its faculty to acknowledge the intrusion of external agencies into internal campus prerogatives. The growing focus on accountability and assessment has created new and significant faculty external responsibilities.

The national movement toward statewide planning and coordination for public higher education during the past 25 years initially took the forms of statewide master plans and regular academic program review. The purpose was both understandable and largely laudable. Public higher education had been and was experiencing unprecedented growth; enrollments were increasing, new campuses were created and established campuses were expanded. There were genuine concerns on the part of state political and governmental leaders as well as many within the higher education community nationally over the possible consequences of unplanned and uncoordinated growth and proliferation. State higher education master plans were developed to guide and monitor that growth. Academic programs were to be justified and maintained if the review process demonstrated a societal need that was being appropriately satisfied. Further, there was a stated concern over program proliferation and duplication.

Fortunately, academic planning and program review processes at most institutions fell into existing faculty curricular

governance structures. Faculty departmental and college committees assumed the responsibility for the self-studies, which are at the core of academic program review. The self-studies are conducted within guidelines established often by external governing or coordinating boards. In Illinois, for example, each academic program is reviewed at least once every 5-7 years by departmental, college, and university faculty committees with administrative involvement. The institutional self-studies are subsequently reviewed by professional staffs at both the governing and coordinating board levels, and involve campus faculty interacting with those staffs.

The most recent manifestation of the accountability movement has been the product of a growing assertiveness on the part of state government officials, including both governors and legislatures, for documentation to assess institutional performance. *Assessment* has become the buzzword that captures the mood of this movement. Stated simply, it is a reflection of growing skepticism on the part of government, business and industry, and regional and specialized accreditation agencies about the performance of college and university undergraduate programs.

That skepticism has produced efforts by state coordinating agencies, encouraged again by both state governors and legislative leaders, to develop institutional and program accountability measures documenting campus performance in terms of student achievements. As state colleges and universities grapple with the challenge of developing appropriate assessment processes and measures to meet those external mandates, the responsibility has been assumed either through existing faculty curricular and program review procedures or new faculty processes directed specifically at assessment. Both academic program review and the assessment of student outcomes thrust faculty from their traditional campus-based roles as guardians of academic standards into increasing external relationships with those agencies and organizations that provide institutional funding, oversee institutional performance, and employ and evaluate institutional graduates. In each of these academic program

accountability roles, faculty join academic administrative officers in presenting and defending institutional positions.

One final faculty external responsibility might be noted: participation in governance and institutional representation. Briefly, both collective bargaining and increased faculty participation on boards of trustees or in state coordinating agencies have created fairly new, structured roles for external responsibility. Many state colleges and universities have accepted faculty collective bargaining, which results in two major consequences. New and frequently very different internal governance roles and responsibilities develop. Externally, collective bargaining has resulted in faculty unions functioning in systemwide or statewide arenas for negotiation purposes and representing faculty positions in legislative and executive chambers. In addition, in Illinois as well as other states, governing boards and even statewide coordinating boards have created formal advisory roles for faculty. Both the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the institutional governing boards have established formal faculty advisory committees that meet regularly with the boards in open meetings and participate in various standing committees.

The preceding analysis of faculty responsibilities external to the campus has discussed both individual and more institutionally based faculty roles. Both forms exemplify the observations of President Ikenberry and Professor Wingfield. Not all faculty perform effectively in external roles, not all faculty enjoy or derive satisfaction from them, not all faculty possess the capability to perform them. But there is little doubt that faculty responsibilities for "boundary spanning" will increase in frequency, diversity, and significance for public colleges and universities.

The American land-grant tradition may historically and legally be claimed by those institutions identified as such. But at the same time new, yet ill-defined, land-grant type missions are evolving for most public institutions of higher education, particularly those in essentially urban and suburban service areas.

Colleges and universities have increasingly become central to governmental strategies for regional economic development and diversification and for addressing, as public-policy partners, other problems of contemporary America. Limited institutional funding from tax revenues and increased costs have resulted in serious exploration of private funding for public institutions through corporate-university collaboration in both traditional and emerging academic activities. Faculty research, faculty participation in off-campus continuing professional education, faculty design of instructional programs in response to these environmental developments—all lead to one almost inescapable conclusion. State college and university faculties will find their longstanding, traditional roles and responsibilities extended and enlarged beyond the conventional boundaries of the campus in a multitude of ways. The growing insistence on performance justification for public investments in public higher education make this movement important and inevitable.

8

Partnerships With Business Challenge Traditional Collegiate Roles

Robert A. Scott

Concern about the role of university faculty in society is universal in both place and time. Concern varies in regard to degree and balance. Recurring themes in the debate include priority of institutional mission versus faculty interests; narrow specialization vs. a liberal arts approach; basic vs. applied research; scholarship vs. teaching, and each of these vs. public service; and the tensions that exist between the ideal of learning for its own sake and society's emphasis on credentials and the solution of immediate problems. These tensions arise in different degrees at different times on different college campuses.

Just as the degree of emphasis on institutional mission and faculty activity can vary by place and time, so also does the resulting role of individual faculty members. There have been changes in the role of individual faculty members in relation to society at large; the role of the institution in relation to other social institutions and organizations; and the role of individual faculty members in support of the institutional mission to serve society (in addition to serving society as an individual or consultant).

The Role of Faculty in Fulfilling the Institutional Mission for Service

This is the area of greatest change in recent years, as the state and private sector have increased their expectations concerning how institutions will serve society. Institutional leaders increasingly have turned to faculty to fulfill these expectations.

The roles and expectations of individual faculty and academic units to meet public needs are historic, not new. This is demonstrated by schools of agriculture and their extension services, schools of medicine and their clinical practices, and schools of education and their lab schools. But these activities were not institutional obligations per se; they were departmental and school *programs*. And university faculty throughout the

industrial world have the equivalent of at least one day per week for consulting and commercial activity.

Today, state governments and private industry express their expectations for universities to serve the ends of economic development and international trade. As a result, the relationships between institutions of higher education and industries are developing in new ways, evolving from patronage to partnership.

Patron, Client, Partner: Corporate-College Relations

For years, higher education has looked to business as a patron. Thorstein Veblen and John Jay Chapman attained a degree of their fame by deriding such relationships.[1]

In the past decade, corporate America has become a more important source of college revenue. During this period, corporate support of higher education has increased by 235 percent compared with 65 percent from the federal government, 15 percent from state government, and 132 percent from voluntary contributions.

One of the ways relationships between business and higher education have changed is suggested by the term *client.* Institutions enter into contracts to provide such services as research and training to client corporations and industry associations. These services include not only biotechnology and computing but also management development and language training.

The third relationship, in addition to patron and client, is that of "partner." Even a four-year college the size of Ramapo can enter into such arrangements.

These three roles have existed for some time, of course, but the number and complexity of examples have increased in response to new demands and new expectations from major sources of institutional funding.

Metaphors for Collegiate Contributions to Corporate Development

Relations between colleges and corporations can be divided into four categories that further define the roles of client and partner. These categories, drawn from the field of business, include joint venture, licensing, overseas development, and trade.

An example of *joint ventures* is Ramapo's arrangement with Lederle Laboratories (the Medical Research Division of American Cyanamid), which includes eleven Ph.D. scientists from Lederle conducting basic research in neurosciences under corporate and government contracts with Ramapo faculty in a joint lab on our campus. This arrangement provides opportunities for Ramapo students to serve as lab assistants and co-op interns, and to begin to qualify for the joint Ramapo-Rutgers B.S.-Graduate articulation agreement in biology and chemistry. Another example is the joint development by Ramapo, Rutgers, the Port Authority, and the New Jersey Division of International Trade of the NJ Center for International Business Education.

An example of *licensing* is Ramapo's arrangement with Bio-Metallics, to which the college has "sold" faculty time for research and for which it also receives an annual cash stipend and a percentage of revenues from the procedures developed by the faculty member. Another form of "licensing" is Ramapo's plan to offer on its campus the Rutgers University MBA as a high-quality, well-known programmatic convenience to area executives in international business.

In *overseas development*, Ramapo works with the state banks of Indonesia, where it advises executive development programs on English language training and preparation for graduate management education in the United States. Ramapo is also working with a new state-sponsored consulting firm in Shanghai to expand cultural and trade relations with Israel.

Trade occurs in fund raising, which can be considered an "exchange of values"—a trade of valued services that benefits

each side. The "values," or valued institutional services, to be exchanged for corporate donations of cash, equipment and in-kind contributions (such as executives on loan, landscaping, and even the simple use of a construction crane) may be described as "intellectual," "cultural," and "physical."

Intellectual services to be offered include regular courses or custom-designed seminars offered on campus or at a corporate site; advising; consulting; conferences on special topics; research; library or database access, etc. Particular projects include programs on Japanese language and culture for the American employees of Japanese firms; seminars on American business history and practice for Japanese executives, and conferences for American firms on the European Economic Community in 1992 and beyond, and on marketing in the Pacific Rim.

Cultural services include group rates to plays, concerts, and exhibits; special corporate "family" nights at events, and even special events for corporate clients. The use of physical facilities may be offered to corporations for recreation, sales meetings, and holiday parties. Some institutions even develop research or science parks near a campus where both start-up and mature companies can gain easy access to university researchers and results.

In each case, a major consideration when deciding on such arrangements is compatibility with institutional mission and individual academic freedom for teaching and research.

Institutions offer services in response to changes in the social and economic environment for higher education, as well as for reasons of mission. States are more active in setting priorities for higher education initiatives through increased programs of competitive grant funding as opposed to full funding of basic necessities of salaries, equipment, and facilities. States call upon colleges and universities to provide research and training to the private sector in efforts to support economic development.

Given these changes in the financial support of higher education, college and university presidents have had to think of

"markets" as well as mission in fulfilling their responsibilities as academic leaders and financial managers, and in setting priorities for collective institutional efforts. "Strategic" is now a common term on campuses. Those forces, as well as the increased magnitude of campus needs, and the increased involvement on campus of corporate executives, have resulted in these new arrangements and services.

Reasons for Caution

Caution must be taken, however, when developing new services. Most of us think of higher education in terms of teaching, research, and service based on mission. We now see the need to consider market as well as mission in setting priorities. But we also need to consider these roles of the university in a new way in order to understand the tensions related to the mission-market balance.

First, each institution has a mission as a campus—i.e., as a center for teaching and scholarship apart from society, but contributing to it. The campus both preserves traditions and creates new knowledge. It relates to people and their artifacts as well as to their futures. As a campus, an institution preserves, creates, and prepares. Second, collegiate institutions are also social organizations, parts of society that must be understood in terms of the great themes of social science—community, authority, status, the sacred, and alienation.

Colleges are unique institutions in this way. They are apart from and a part of society. They are at the periphery, the cutting edge in terms of science and technology, analysis and interpretation, as well as the creation of new knowledge and challenge to the status quo. Yet they are also at the center of things, playing an instrumental role in helping society evolve from one era to another. Through the interpretation and reinterpretation of knowledge, they become a source of wisdom.

Institutions need to be at the center of things, and to preserve the past and prepare their students for the future. But they also need the experience of being at the edge and the freedom to express a new vision of the future. The new demands on institutions of higher education can distort this balance. But the balance must be preserved in order to protect the integrity of institutions.

There are other reasons for concern as well. Institutional incentives and rewards to encourage faculty efforts in support of the institutional mission for service must be developed and refined. How should these new efforts be incorporated with those already considered when making decisions about salary, tenure, and rank? How should these forms of service be considered when recruiting new faculty?

Colleges need criteria for saying no to proposed arrangements that are not congruent with institutional mission and priorities. After all, they need their faculty to teach and advise students; running a company is not part of their mission. A college needs clear criteria about its institutional role in providing value-added services as opposed to on-going operations or management to a private-sector patron. Ramapo has rejected two proposed joint ventures that would have required the college to distort its priorities, permit proprietary research on campus, and dedicate excessive amounts of faculty time.

Competing Roles

Society's needs for educational services and applied research are great, and through credit and noncredit instruction, consulting, and sponsored research, college and university faculties are aiding in economic development and state strategy for international trade. Yet at the same time, one must be concerned about the dynamic tensions that develop on campus in response to these needs: students as both late adolescents and appren-

tices; faculty members as professionals balancing the demands of teaching, scholarship, and professional practice; and corporate patrons as essential to campus progress but still external to it and a cause of concern about academic freedom. Such concerns lead to questions about the role of faculty in support of institutional mission as well as about the role of university faculty in contemporary society.

Note

[1]Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 346.

9

The Faculty Role In Maintenance Of Professions And Promotion Of The Arts

Jewel Plummer Cobb

The responsibility of higher education institutions is to society at large. This responsibility is complex. Its most important component is instruction. But colleges also have a broader responsibility to the community outside the campus. Universities are leaders that set the tone and direction for society, and faculty play a substantial role in this leadership.

In addition to the instructional role, faculty also serve as consultants to business and government. They operate multilevel athletic programs, coordinate diverse research projects, warehouse historical data and publications, and prepare students for various levels of government and for military service. Faculty often provide professional counseling and guidance to students through the academic mentoring system. They contribute a knowledge base that maintains the standards of the professions.

To achieve excellence in education, faculty members must transcend mere instruction to bond the internal university system with the real world beyond its campus maintaining the professions, promoting arts and culture, and thereby enhancing the quality of life in society.

The basic tenet of all professions is that they are self-maintained—that there is a certain internal autonomy, a series of beliefs, and a commonly applied knowledge base that controls and determines professional outcomes and opportunities. Since members of each profession serve a dual role of both practitioners and responsible members of that profession seeking always to make it better, the role of the faculty members is twofold. They are responsible for both the maintenance and sustenance of their institutions. In addition to the faculty's academic responsibility to educate and prepare students for the professions, the faculty study the *substance* of the professions through *related* academic disciplines.

Faculty are able to instill students with a creativity and a fresh, invigorating approach to the professional field. That is certainly true if one looks at the expansion of knowledge within the medical profession. Changes in the practice of medicine are

driven by changes in the theoretical base of knowledge of biology and chemistry, for example, and were it not for the faculty involved in research, many changes in the practice within the medical profession would not occur.

Within the university structure one needs not so much to study a profession's application but rather to explore its theory. This exploration stimulates and maintains the professions by generating a constant supply of newly educated professionals with new visions and new ideas geared toward the future and not yet constrained by existing practice.

What are the components for conveying professional standards? The process for the selection of a faculty member as a validated expert in a given field must be rigorous and must include screening by colleagues in the discipline. The question must always be asked before hiring a given faculty member, "Is this the very best professor/expert we can find?" Selection is a weighty and serious matter. The duration and quality of the knowledge base to which the students, undergraduate and graduate, will be exposed is long term, and important because it is permanent and irreversible.

The faculty's role must also be clear as nonpartisan scholars. This role is challenging and sometimes difficult. A society or community holds a cluster of ideals, beliefs, and attitudes. These must be open to unbiased review by students because they must be exposed to all facets of a given topic before they can arrive at final beliefs and attitudes. This cluster of ideals, beliefs, and attitudes can be shaped as goals transmitted by the scholar. They form the standards and determine to a large degree the quality of the disciplines. Although each new form of data is processed and interpreted at the individual level, teachers can set the level of expectations and exposure to stimulating, rational ideas. Only the faculty can interpret accurately the way the humanities, for example, relate to modern life and enrich history, literature, public policy, philosophy, or social interactions. Faculty are the prime determinants of students' frame of reference for

developing religious beliefs, whatever they may be, a value system, humaneness, sensitivity, tolerance, self-appreciation, and cultural expression.

Quality faculty serve as role models for the students and as standard bearers to uphold the intellectual integrity of the discipline and profession they represent. The faculty role here is the pivotal role as the dynamic force in the university for transmission of new knowledge, the historical context, the trends and issues confronting the student, the expectations for high achievement by students, and the proper content and breadth of the field to future members of the profession.

In all colleges and universities in America the role of the professor as teacher is pivotal because it is in the classroom that the most impressionable and meaningful transfer of knowledge takes place. A literal "passing of the gauntlet" must occur if the standards of the discipline are to be practiced in a given profession.

The final outcome for students should be *professional identity*—that is, the manner in which graduates integrate the professionals' norms, competencies, and values into self. In order to reach this stage of professional identity, studies have shown, students must master knowledge and skills in the profession. Therefore, the faculty play a central role in developing the foundation of information a student will later apply, live, and absorb.

College faculty often seem larger than life to students and many other people in society and, hence, can wield great influence. As members of the institutions of higher learning, they contribute to the growth and improvement of society by disseminating knowledge. In so doing they help foster a more peaceful and a better quality of life. They are under a profound obligation not only to interpret the contemporary society but also to open new doors and new avenues of thinking. They must also encourage students to approach them for inspiration and guidance.

Faculty are largely responsible for the present state of universities. They are responsible, too, for what is missing in

them. They are responsible for transmitting a sense of humanism and strong examples of ethical values so that when students move into their professional worlds, they will carry with them not only a knowledge base, but mature attitudes and philosophies.

What is the faculty's obligation to the maintenance of culture? The modern university or college in the United States plays a major role in providing an environment that will nurture the artist and also the products of that art. It does this by celebrating the intrinsic value of those arts and by allowing them to flourish in their total creativity and diversity. It also encourages appreciation, understanding, and, of course, enjoyment of the arts. It is a challenge to the educational institution to foster the "civilizing and elevating" influences of the arts so they can be experienced with maximum understanding.

Although there are, of course, specific monolithic educational institutions or institutes devoted exclusively to teaching the arts, I speak now from the perspective of the multipurpose university or college, public or private. The liberal arts college, for example, and the larger universities have incorporated as a fundamental policy arrangements to provide a climate in which the individual can achieve as a performer. The university also provides a structure for the visual artists dedicated to the serious study of certain unique principles and techniques that combine with the imagination to form the basis for expression in the arts. Arts faculty should encourage dedicated students by virtue of their presence and talent as role models. In the arts, students and faculty work closely in a unique and unusual learning experience to build creative and professional excellence.

This outgrowth of the classroom to the studio is an optimal arrangement because in the studio there is a blending, if you will, of the personalities, dedication, and talent of the artistic faculty member and the aspiring artist. A serious study of the arts is an obligation for an institution that undertakes studio instruction. It is not a trivial pursuit—some people may believe that art is primarily entertainment instead of a serious profession. But in the quality institutions of this country it is a serious endeavor to

be engaged by the student prepared to sacrifice, to work hard, and to be pleased by the outcome of those endeavors.

Higher education provides an environment for the full expression of artistic endeavor and an environment uniting exhibiting artists, contributing designers, music ensembles, solo performers, conductors, directors, technical staff for theater groups, consultants, and community support members. It should cultivate this environment so that the larger external community can be enlightened, refreshed, and enriched. Additional professional adjunct groups may also be a part of university life, as exemplified by quartets in residence, dance repertoire companies, museums open to the public, resident theater groups, repertoire groups, and, of course, arts for children. An important component of this effort is education of the community, often through docents, arts patronage, donor development, and fund raising.

The particular and specific professional training by institutions that provide undergraduate arts instruction produces several beneficial byproducts. The resources of the faculty as professional role models in the arts provide the basis for preparing new teachers who will teach the arts at K-12 levels and beyond. A college arts faculty can provide myriad services to public school efforts beyond teacher training. For example, the campus can provide curriculum development for the K-12 teacher of the arts, can provide inservice training for teachers, and can form a partnership with public schools for other arts efforts that are important for the enlightenment of the child. Traveling art shows, traveling children's theater groups, and art internships or student teaching arrangements enrich children's early exposure to the arts.

Higher education institutions are frequently the cultural centers of their communities. They are often the most significant presenters of the arts in the nation by way of their campus's performing arts events that are open to the public. Having been inspired by the professional faculty present on the campus, they

then provide a standard of excellence that can be incorporated into the local community. The university is a special kind of haven for artists—a financial stability often providing a steady and consistent base from which the artist can then teach and inspire those who follow. Resident faculties of professional artists who come in as adjunct faculty or as faculty for temporary periods of time are important also for the preservation and the growth of certain art forms. The practicing professional actor, the famous playwright, or the important director who comes to the campus as a master teacher allows students to reach another level of expectation, another level of artistic standards. They, in turn, will move out into the community to perform. Numerous orchestras, performing theater companies, and museums could not survive were it not for the affiliation of many of their personnel with a higher education institution. The presence of distinguished faculty and advanced students often provides a core of artistic experience utilized not only in teaching but also in cultural policy development.

The preservation of cultural heritage is another important role played by higher education. Works of historical significance that may not be widely known to the public are frequently presented in repertoire on campuses. Likewise, techniques and procedures in art restoration and conservation and the maintenance of archives are important skills and talents that students learn in the course of their undergraduate education.

It is important to reflect on what the arts mean to people and, hence, the importance of the art faculty member to the maintenance of art and culture for our society. In a recent broad-based survey, a substantial 90+ percent of respondents felt that "to see something performed on stage is more meaningful and exciting than watching it on television." An even higher majority believed that "museums are an important resource for the whole community because they tell us so much about the art and history of different cultures and about science and our environment." An equal number felt that museums and museum

performances "make a community a better place to live." Nine out of ten also felt that "some means should be found to present more performances of music, theater and dance in all parts of the country so that all Americans can have an opportunity to attend."[1] Clearly this prevailing attitude is a solid and wide mandate for the importance of the arts.

Faculty are the standard bearers for the future of the contemporary intellectual world. They participate in the shaping of public policy. They play important roles in maintaining, by example, standards of behavior and professional ethics. Higher education has been creative in carrying knowledge to a larger and more varied audience. The relationship of academe to society has contributed to developing, shaping, and nurturing the arts. In brief, faculty play a central and pivotal role in the maintenance of modern civilization.

Note

[1]*America and the Arts*, No. V. Nationwide Survey of Public Opinion conducted by the National Research Center of the Arts—an affiliate of Louis Harris and Associates, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10111. January 1988.

10

Faculty Community Service: Contribution And Consequence

John C. Unrue

During the last decade American state colleges and universities have recognized the need to communicate more and effectively with their cities, towns, and communities. In recent years, steadily rising costs and declining state revenues have made it impossible for state governments to support adequately their state institutions. Administrators now speak of their campuses as state assisted rather than state supported. They have been required, therefore, to nurture a public constituency in order to develop and sustain their institutions. James L. Fisher, a successful university president, has written boldly about the necessity for good external relations. He says quite directly, "The president must identify and cultivate the people with the power and the money to help the college or university reach its goals.[1] He has also quoted Father Theodore Hesburgh, who once commented that "anyone who isn't heard outside the campus isn't worth being heard inside."[2]

Although faculty members have not assumed the university development responsibilities of presidents and development officers, they have to an increasingly greater degree in many institutions extended their talents and services into their communities and regions. Their contributions beyond the walls of academe serve the public good, underscore the college's or university's broader relevance, and generate confidence and good will. The efforts of these faculty members are not merely well-intended but well-placed, and they have garnered respect, the forerunner of support, for themselves and their institutions.

In American colleges and universities, it is probably the continuing education program that provides the most structured opportunities for faculty to participate in service activities beyond the walls of the institution and outside the parameters of the traditional curriculum, because continuing education courses are designed for the precise purpose of extending educational and cultural opportunities into the community. This unit on my own campus, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is administered by a dean whose staff meets regularly with faculty members from a

wide variety of departments in order to develop courses based on special areas of faculty expertise.

Our university attempts to develop courses of special regional interest and relevance. For several years, for example, one of our most prominent geology professors has conducted tours through Death Valley, an area about which he is extremely knowledgeable. The professor lectures on the geology of the area and discusses its history. The tour includes a visit to a primitive but characteristically western opera house built in the late nineteenth century. The Death Valley tour has been extraordinarily successful and has appealed to a wide variety of citizens in our community.

Several of our continuing education courses are designed to enable faculty to provide more than one kind of service: they acquaint participants with interesting skills and engage them in activities that serve a community or regional need. One such program is planned for the fall semester of 1989 and is called "Rescue Archaeology in Moapa Valley."[3] The course was conceived by an archaeologist from our anthropology department who became alarmed when she discovered that land developers were beginning to clear an area near Overton, Nevada, discovered to be an Anasazi Indian site. The archaeologist had led students on field trips, and she knew well that the site was fragile and that land development would destroy artifacts. The course she is providing will train participants in techniques of archaeological excavation and enable them to assist the instructor, other faculty volunteers, and students in field reclamation of the region. Those enrolled in the class will benefit from the training and interesting field experiences while at the same time providing an essential service to the region by assisting in the preservation of the human history of Nevada.

In a larger sense, many other activities made possible by the service of faculty members who participate in continuing education programs fulfill more than one purpose. Such activities provide rich opportunities and generate within the participants a

respect for the environment they come to know firsthand and to appreciate. These opportunities are provided by what we at the University of Nevada call "exploring trips." Each year the Continuing Education Division offers more than twenty Saturday programs designed to provide environmental education in a field-trip setting. These trips are conducted from an interdisciplinary perspective and usually led by three faculty members who might study such topics as ornithology or history of the region. Faculty members share their research with an actively involved public and stimulate interest in and respect for the region. Because of the highly informal nature of such trips, social rank and status distinctions fade, academic reserve loosens, and more effective communication is possible. Participants complete their exploring trips with good feelings about their experiences and the region. They, the faculty members involved, and the university have made new friends.

Occasionally Continuing Education joins larger units on campus in order to develop programs serving a specific public need. Recently, at the urging of one professor, Continuing Education and our School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation joined to develop a summer physical education program for minority young people. With the support of the director of his school, the dean of his college, and the provost, the professor began working early in the term to seek resources that would enable him to bus young students from poor neighborhoods to the campus, to arrange for supervision of activities, and to provide them with lunch at the end of the daily activity. When he learned that the National Collegiate Athletic Association provided funding for the kind of program he was attempting to develop, he applied for a grant and received it.[5] Although the grant was not sufficient to cover all expenses, when it was added to resources provided by the university, he was able to implement his program.

As is often the case, the vision and determination of one faculty member intent upon providing a service to the community have created a community resource beyond even his own expec-

tations. At this very moment nearly one hundred young people are involved in the National Youth Sports Program, proudly wearing program T-shirts. These are children of parents who did not attend colleges or universities, or in most instances finish high school. They are on a university campus every day, enjoying the environment, enjoying the activities, and enjoying the friendship of other young people. They have a sense of place that could be vital to their future, and the faculty member responsible for their being on campus hopes that they will be motivated to return one day to ensure their future.

Of course, all disciplines do not lend themselves equally well to service outside the university. Philosophy and literature professors, whose areas are at the heart of the liberal arts and humane learning, cannot so readily apply their academic talents to society and its problems as can faculty members from what we have come to call the more "applied disciplines." Nevertheless there are opportunities for faculty from the more traditional academic areas to contribute to their communities. Many opportunities are made possible by state-based humanities programs,under the direction of state humanities committees and councils supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities.[6] These organizations, which exist in every state, develop programs rich in humanities content and make them available to community and civic groups that might benefit most from them.

Each of these programs is required to have among its participants an academic humanist, a humanities faculty member from a college or university in the state. Humanities faculty members are able, therefore, to share their academic skills with citizens in the community who have had little exposure to the humanities. English department faculty members from my own campus have participated recently in an interesting humanities program designed for physicians and medical interns in residency in our city. Literature professors specializing in a variety of literacy periods and genres conducted sessions in which they

lectured and led discussions about specific literary works. Those physicians participating in the program were assigned works in advance of the weekly sessions. Because each of these programs is evaluated, not only by the participants but by other academic humanists, it is possible to judge to some extent the success of the sessions. The results of the program, documented in a report filed with the state humanities committee, reveal admiration for the competence and skill of the professors and praise for their enthusiasm and effectiveness. Several of the participants have also expressed confidence in the university's English department, and several have enrolled in courses at the university. Some physicians have supported the university's own humanities programs with their time and their resources, and within the past few years at least one physician has established an annual humanities award for the faculty member judged the year's outstanding teacher.

In a report to the President of the United States, the Congress, and the American People, entitled *Humanities in America*, Lynn V. Cheney, chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities, has praised the state-based programs and the contributions they made to American society. She also has commended civic groups for joining the federal effort to make public humanities programming possible. Chairperson Cheney has also noted that "public programming in the humanities is now so substantial and extensive that it has become a kind of parallel school, one that has grown up outside established institutions of education."[7] The service provided by faculty members who participate in public humanities programs is to a considerable degree responsible for their success.

Not all faculty members are inclined to participate in programs like those sponsored by the National Endowment of the Humanities, especially younger scholars who are in probationary periods awaiting tenure decisions. Most America colleges and universities that emphasize research from which national and international reputations are derived do not encourage such ac-

tivities. Cheney herself admits that "young scholars hoping for tenure are particularly reluctant to become involved in public programming, because it is not regarded by academic peers as activity that is sufficiently scholarly."[8]

Cheney's observation is absolutely correct, and the attitude to which she refers is a prevailing one, not limited obviously to humanities programs, but to all kinds of faculty service external to the college or university. Many presidents, vice presidents, and others would agree that service to the community by faculty members is not the substance upon which academic reputations are created. The issue is one of perspective, and we are obliged to communicate to all faculty members that service, particularly in research institutions or in those striving to become research institutions, must *supplement* scholarship, not be undertaken in lieu of it. Commenting on this point in a book called *Deaning*, Van Cleve Morris suggested that when comparing service performed within the institution to that performed outside, the "extramural sphere of service presents more complicated and unfamiliar problems of assessment and evaluation." Morris indicates that there are two criteria that can be applied in attempts to measure the value of the service. The first is apparent: the identifiable public relations benefit that results from the faculty member's activity. The second criterion, observes Morris, is "the programmatic result of the faculty member's endeavor in the wider community."[9]

Community service does indeed yield measurable programmatic results. One of our philosophy professors with an intense interest in ethics has spoken to business and professional groups and to local government officials frequently during the past few years. His theme has been a common one: the importance of ethical conduct in the work place.[10] He has stressed the relevance of ethics in businesses, the professions, and government. His observations are not original, though perhaps his enthusiasm and tenacity are rare. He has been effective in his speeches, lectures, and discussions. The responses, both formal

and informal, led to encouragement of and support for an interdisciplinary graduate degree program in ethics and policy studies. The professor pursued the request by presenting a formal proposal to his department. The proposal received support from his peers, appropriate campus review committees, and the administration.

That the philosophy professor's community service had been successful and of high quality was certain when the board of regents approved the new program. In addition to observing the academic strength and proper budget support for the proposal, board members noted strong endorsement from the business and professional community, which combined with other institutional statements to demonstrate need for the program. Indeed, such community endorsements alone could not suffice to prove need or academic quality. As pieces of a larger process that led to the implementation of a peer-reviewed degree program, they do suggest that the professor's public service stimulated many and probably inspired a major curriculum project, the value of which could be measured.

Precisely because of the varied services provided by faculty, many cities and communities have come to regard colleges and universities as vital resources in the search for solutions to their problems. Indeed, nearly every academic department on our campuses today has faculty members who have contributed significantly to society. Nurses and physicians from our health sciences faculty donate their time to public health fairs, which provide free blood tests and cholesterol examinations; biologists work with environmental groups to assess air and water quality and to determine nutrient content in lakes and streams; chemistry faculty advise local governments about hazardous and toxic waste, and serve as expert witnesses against industries for whom the profit motive often appears to loom larger than conservation of our natural resources or the public health; social psychologists counsel business and professional groups about stress; exercise physiologists conduct fitness classes for our aging population in

order to improve cardiovascular functions; faculty from a variety of disciplines work in adult literacy programs. The list is endless.

American communities certainly look to their colleges and universities for solutions and support during times of crisis and catastrophe, and it has been my experience that faculty members have always been available and willing to provide help and to serve. Nearly everyone can cite an example to affirm the support role faculty have played when the need has arisen. On November 21, 1981, the resort industry of Las Vegas suffered the most devastating fire in its history when the luxurious MGM Hotel burned. Rescue units set up temporary hospital units wherever possible, including a small gymnasium on our campus.[11] Nursing faculty worked throughout the day attending to the injured and suffering. Foreign language faculty served as interpreters, bringing order out of chaos and facilitating the efforts of nurses and physicians to provide desperately needed medical attention to burn victims. The service of our faculty on that memorable day, in which more than 80 people lost their lives, was not motivated by expectations of reward or advancement but by compassion and a strong sense of common humanity. The consequences of the faculty service were a deep and abiding appreciation from those who were helped the the establishment of our young university's place in the community in a way it had not previously enjoyed.

Ours is a time during which we in state colleges and universities must look to the public and private sectors for resources with which to meet our academic goals. In less densely populated areas such as those in the West, in which my university is located, the importance of personal associations and personal relationships established by faculty members while serving their communities should not be underestimated. Even the legislative process in these regions is often personal, and legislators, oblivious to the constraints of academic protocol, occasionally seek validation of institutional budget requests not merely from administrators whose formal duty is to present and defend those

requests but also from faculty members whom they and their constituencies have grown to admire and respect because of their contributions to the community. We need friends, and we need their financial support. Fortunately, for many of us those essential friends and support are present today, present to great measure as a not-altogether expected consequence of dedicated, competent, and often benevolent faculty who have served the public and the university exceedingly well.

Notes

[1]James L. Fisher, *Power of the Presidency* (New York: MacMillan, 1984), p. 128.

[2]Fisher, p. 121.

[3]The Moapa Valley is located approximately fifty-five miles northeast of Las Vegas, Nevada. There is a Southern Paiute Indian reservation in the valley at present.

[4]The Anasazi Indians were a Pueblo people believed to have lived from 1 a.d. to 1200 a.d. Nevada archaeologists believe this to be the area in which they lived.

[5]This year the National Collegiate Athletic Association will be providing nearly 1,400 grants to colleges and universities in support of disadvantaged young people. This organization provides additional assistance by soliciting donations from sports companies in support of the programs housed on campuses. The MacGregor Company will furnish uniforms and sports equipment for the summer program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

[6]The National Endowment for the Humanities implemented six pilot programs in 1970 in order to advance the humanities in public life. By the mid-1970s the programs had proved to be so successful that each state received federal funding in support of humanities committees or councils. Funds for the endowment are sought as part of the budget request of the President of the United States. The request requires congressional approval.

[7]Lynn V. Cheney, *Humanities in America* (Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1988), p. 27.

[8]Cheney, p. 28.

[9]Van Cleve Morris, *Deaning* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1981), p. 57.

[10]There is considerable interest in ethics studies in American academe today. See *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*, by Wayne C. Booth

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988). Professor Booth has written an important study of literary criticism from an ethical point of view. See also *The Closing of the American Mind*, by Allan Bloom (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987). Although Professor Bloom's provocative work does not focus specifically on ethics, it does advocate an affirmation of values he regards as essential to making qualitative judgments. He argues against "value relativism" and "cultural relativism," which he believes encourage democratization of curricula to the detriment of education and conduct.

[11]See the *Las Vegas Review Journal* and the *Las Vegas Sun*, November 21-22, 1981. The news of the MGM fire was carried in newspapers throughout the United States; however, the local papers are extensive in their coverage and personal interviews.

Appendix: The Conference Program

Universita Degli Studi di Roma
"La Sapienza"

American Association of State Colleges
and Universities

"Il ruolo del professore universitario
nella societ contemporanea"
ROMA 2-3 giugno 1989

"The Role of University Professor in
the Contemporary Society"
ROME June 2-3, 1989

Traduzione simultanea

Invito
Invitation

IL RETTORE
(Giorgio Tecce)

La S.V. e invitata alla Conferenza congiunta Italia-USA su "IL ruolo del Professore Universitario nella societ contemporanea," che si terra il 2 e 3 giugno 1989 presso il CENTRO CONGRESSI UNIVERSITA "LA SAPIENZA" Via Salaria, 113-ROMA

Parteciperanno per gli Stati Uniti d'America i Rettori di 16 Universit statali, associate all'AASCU.

PROGRAMMA

Venerdi 2 giugno ore 9 - 12.30	Saluto del Magnifico Rettore del- l'Universita degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza" prof. Giorgio Tecce. Saluto del Pro-Rettore dell'Universita degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza" prof. Giorgio Di Matteo. Saluto del prof. Clyde Wingfield, Senior Fellow American Association of State Colleges and Universities Chair, AASCU Conference Planning Committee
Presiedono:	Prof. Carlo de Marco, Preside della Facolt di Medicina Prof. Roland Dille, President, Moorhead State University (MN) "Due realta a confronto"
Relatori:	Prof. Saverio Avveduto Prof. Sabino Cassese Prof. Eugene Trani Prof. Joseph Murphy
Intervallo	
Discussione generale	
Venerdi 2 giugno ore 15,30 - 18,00	Il Professore Universitario all'interno dell'Universita

Presiedono:	Prof. Achille Tartaro, Preside della Facolt di Lettere
	Prof. Evelyn Hively, Vice President Academic Programs AASCU
Relatori:	Mario Belardinelli "Organizzazione generale della didattica" Prof. David Lavin "Instruction, Curriculum and Outcomes" Prof. Benedetto Vertecchi "Tutoraggio degli allievi—Sistemi di valutazione" Prof. Carol Guardo "Faculty Role in Governance of the University"
Intervallo	
Presiedono:	Prof. Francesco Castelli, Universita "LA Sapienza" Prof. Clyde J. Wingfield, Senior Fellow American Association of State Colleges and Universities Chair, AASCU Conference Planning Committee
Relatori:	Prof. Mirella Casini Schaerf "Uso delle tecnologie educative" Prof. Peter Cayan "Impact of Technology on Faculty Performance" Prof. Carlo Di Castro

"Rapporto Didattica-Ricerca"
Prof. Judith Sturnick
"Research and Scholarship"

Discussione generale

Sabato 3 giugno — Il Professore Universitario
Ore 9,00 - 12,30 — nella societa

Presiedono: Prof. Ernesto Chiacchierini,
Preside della Facolta di Economia e Commercio

Prof. Richard Landini,
President, Indiana State University

Prof. Stefano Rodota
(Rapporti con le pubbliche istituzioni nazionali e locali)
Prof. William Monat
(Relations with Local, State and National Governments and Other Institutions)
Prof. Giovanni Somogyi
(Rapporti con il mondo economico e produttivo)
Prof. Robert Scott
(Economic Production and Development/Corporate Relations)

Intervallo

Presiedono: Prof. Claudio Palma,

Universita (La Sapienza)
Prof. Clifton Conrad, Chair
Department of Higher Education—
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Relatori:

Prof. Giovanni Giacobbe
(La funzione di promozione culturale
e di alta formazione)
Prof. Jewell Plummer Cobb
(Faculty Role in Maintenance of
Professions, Promotion of the Arts
and Culture)
Prof. Alberto Isidori
(Servizi per la societa
Prof. John Unrue
(Faculty Responsibility for
Community Service—Expert,
Consultant, Activist, etc.))

Discussione generale

Sabato 3 guigno
ore 15,30—18,00

Presiedono:

Prof. Saverio Avveduto,
Presidente dell'International Council
on Education for Teaching
Prof. Linda Bunnel Jones,
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Minnesota State University System

Intervallo
Discussione generale
Conclusioni

Comitato Organizzativo per l'Italia	Dott. Damiano Ricevuto Direttore Generale Scambi Culturali M.P.I. Prof. Saverio Avveduto Prof. Fiorella Conti Dott. Anna Candel Prof. Francesco Guerra Prof. Alberto Monticone Prof. Giovanni Somogyi
Per gli U.S.A.	Mr. Clyde Wingfield Mrs. Evelyn Hiveley Mr. Robert Scott
Segreteria Tecnica	ICET—Via del Bufalo, 138A Tel. 06/679-4633
Sede Riunioni	Via Salaria, 113—ROMA Tel. 06/47021-843028-855748

Con il patrocinio della Direzione Generale Scambi Culturali con l'Estero
M.P.I.—Via Ippolito Nievo, 35—ROMA—Tel. 06/58495901

Segreteria Organizzativa	Dott.ssa Anna Candela Settore Progetti di ricerca finanziati e per le iniziative culturali dell'Universita (La Sapienza) Tel. 06/4455769

Recently Published by AASCU Press

THE ARTS AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
by Joe N. Prince

DIRECTORY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALLIES FOR ENTERPRISE: Highlights of the 1987–88 National Conferences on Higher Education and Economic Development

MINORITIES IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION: At a Turning Point

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR CHANGE: America's Comprehensive Public State Colleges and Universities
by Fred F. Harcleroad and Allan W. Ostar

EXPLORING COMMON GROUND: A Report on Business/Academic Partnerships

BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS FUNDING GUIDE

American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036–1192

Allan W. Ostar, President

0–88044–118–6

148